

THE œCUMENICAL IDEALS OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

BY

HENRY R. T. BRANDRETH

Priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.2

TO
MY PARENTS

PREFACE

THIS little book has grown out of a series of articles which I originally contributed to *Reunion*; a number of persons were kind enough to say that they found them useful and to suggest their publication in a more permanent form. I am grateful to the Editor of *Reunion* for the permission to reprint material which originally appeared in that review, but the whole has been rewritten and revised so that what appears here does not necessarily represent its editorial policy.

A complete and exhaustive history of the Oxford Movement has yet to be written, and consequently those who would trace the history of the various eirenic activities which resulted from it are compelled to consult a veritable library of books and pamphlets, many of which are rare and difficult of access. In this book I have tried to gather these sources together and to tell a plain tale out of them, in some cases making use of the valuable collection of unpublished documents of the late Dr. F. G. Lee at the moment in my keeping. History is its own best interpreter, and I have been content to record facts and to draw the minimum number of conclusions from them. Inevitably in a little book of this kind I have had to presuppose a certain amount of background knowledge of the general history of the Catholic Revival; any attempt to supply that background would have meant enlarging the work beyond its reasonable limits.

The series of articles in *Reunion* was completed before I realized that I had unwittingly borrowed the title of it from that of an essay by the Dean of Chichester in *Northern Catholicism*; I am indebted to him for kindly allowing me to retain it in the present work. The Rev. R. D. Middleton kindly read the book in type-script and made useful suggestions and the Rev. C. P. M. Jones not only read the proofs but gave much other help as well.

First published 1947

MADE IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	v
I. THE BACKGROUND	i
II. THE EARLY TRACTARIANS	14
III. 1857-1865	31
IV. DR. PUSEY AND THE <i>EIRENICON</i>	40
V. THE PRELUDE TO THE VATICAN COUNCIL	51
VI. "HOME REUNION"	60
VII. THE OLD CATHOLICS	65
VIII. THE ORDER OF CORPORATE REUNION	69
IX. "LEO XIII AND ANGLICAN ORDERS"	73
X. THE TWENTIETH CENTURY	81
INDEX	89

I

THE BACKGROUND

NO great religious movement, if it is to survive and bear fruit, can start as it were *in vacuo* and ignore the foundations of the centuries which have preceded it. The Oxford Movement owed its very life-blood to the traditions which it had inherited, not only from the Church before the break-up of the sixteenth century, but also from the Catholic thought and piety which had survived the Reformation and whose threads it was able to gather and weave together. It was a reassertion of admitted Church principles, not an introduction of novel ideas. Most particularly is this true of the Movement's reunion ideals.

It must be admitted that the fact that a section of Anglican theologians after the Reformation accepted avowedly Protestant principles and ways of thought had some effect on the whole temper of Anglican thought. The forcible separation of the Church of England from the rest of Western Christendom inevitably introduced a schismatic tinge into even the best Anglican thought. It is not possible, therefore, to produce a list of post-Reformation Anglican divines who accepted those views on reunion which have broadly come to be called Anglo-Catholic; almost the only exception is Bishop Andrewes. To take one example: It is perfectly true that in one place Bramhall says that we have no true quarrel with the Petrine claim, and that our controversy is not with the Church of Rome, but with the Court of Rome.¹ But in another place he makes it quite plain that he regards the re-ordination of Presbyterians as necessary for no other reason than that is what the law of the land required; and even if it be argued that he was in this instance merely being conciliatory to the Irish Presbyterians in an admittedly delicate situation, yet it still remains true that he experienced no difficulty in recognizing the non-episcopal reformed ministries on the Continent.² Broadly speaking, one may say that the Caroline Divines approximated to the modern Anglo-Catholic position in regard to union with the rest of the Catholic Church, but differed from it in their attitude towards the non-episcopal bodies. In spite of this fact, however,

¹ *Works* (Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology), vol. II, p. 351.

² *Ibid.*, vol. III, pp. 476 and 516 ff.

there is scarcely a generation from the time of the Reformation to our own day which has not caught, whether perfectly or imperfectly, the vision of a united Christendom. Much may be traced to the influence of Bishop Andrewes, whose figure stands out as a light in the dark days which immediately succeeded the Reformation, and who prayed each Sunday, "O let the heart and soul of all believers again become one,"¹ and each Monday "for the Universal Church; its confirmation and growth. For the Eastern Church; its deliverance and unity. For the Western Church; its restoration and pacification."² In this prayer for unity, in which the voice of controversy was hushed, Andrewes was followed by the great concourse of the Anglican divines.

In the reign of Charles I there were more formal attempts at reunion connected with the missions of Dom Leander a Sancto Martino and Gregorio Panzani. "Father Leander", says a Roman Catholic historian, "was very sanguine in his hopes of an immediate reunion of England with the Holy See. This reunion he strove most zealously to promote. With all respect, however, to his excellent motives, his judgement, in several instances, may fairly be suspected."³ The primary motive of Leander's and Panzani's missions was to settle differences between secular and religious priests of the Roman obedience. Leander, however, had been so sanguine in his hopes of a union that Panzani seems to have been given a wider mission of testing the feelings of the nation towards this subject.⁴

Panzani, a bearer of presents from Cardinal Barberini to Queen Henrietta Maria, was well received by two of the Ministers of State, Cottington and Windebank, and was accepted at Court. A project of union seems to have been discussed and to have had some measure of support. Speaking to Panzani on the subject, Bishop Montague of Chichester "signified a great desire that the breach between the two churches might be made up, and apprehended no danger from publishing the scheme, as things now

¹ *Private Devotions*, ed. Medd, p. 33.

² *Ibid.*, p. 55.

³ Flanagan, *History of the Church in England*, vol. II, p. 323 n.

⁴ The story is told in the *Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani*, ed. by Joseph Berington. The best account apart from that is in S. R. Gardiner's *History of England*. See also an interesting, though unsympathetic, article by J. M. Stone, "Corporate Reunion in the Reign of Charles I," in *The Scottish Review*, April 1889. The matter is also fully dealt with in Dr. Albion's *Charles I and the Court of Rome*.

stood. He said he had frequently made it the subject of his most serious thoughts, and had diligently considered all the requisites of a union, adding, that he was satisfied both the archbishops, with the bishop of London and several others of the episcopal order, besides a great number of the inferior clergy, were prepared to fall in with the Church of Rome as to a supremacy *purely spiritual*; and that there was no other method of ending controversies than by having recourse to some centre of ecclesiastical unity."¹ On another occasion Montague told Panzani that "there were only three bishops that could be counted violently bent against the Church of Rome, viz., Durham, Salisbury and Exeter (Morton, Davenant and Hall); the rest, he said, were very moderate."²

"From the whole", says Panzani, "it was pretty plain that there was a great inclination in many of the Protestant clergy to reunite themselves to the See of Rome; but they kept themselves to themselves, never imparting their minds to one another, much less to the King, for they imagined the spiritual supremacy was a prerogative he would not easily part with."³

But Panzani, as Leander before him, appears to have been over-sanguine and to have taken the zeal of a few men for the temper of the whole body. Dodd, the Roman Catholic historian, in his *Remarks subjoined to the MS. Copy of the Memoirs*, says as much: "The reader may be led away into a belief, that there was a formed design between Urban VIII and King Charles, to unite the two churches; but where lies the intrinsic proof of such an intention? What was done in that regard, was amongst some of the ministry; and in this both parties appear to have been too sanguine and credulous. It is a common misapprehension among foreign Roman Catholics, to imagine that England is immediately returning to the Church of Rome, if either the King, or any of his chief ministers, says or acts anything in their favour."⁴ "However," says the Oratorian Abbé Tabaraud, "souls have never been better disposed to reunion. The Anglicans . . . made no difficulty, in preaching before the Court, of exhorting that the moderate party be treated with tolerance. Their books were on the whole composed in the same spirit. On several points there was a re-approximation to the

¹ Berington, *op. cit.*, p. 238 (ed. of 1813). Montague, however, was not representative, and he was a tried opponent of the Puritan party.

² *Ibid.*, p. 246.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 243.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

doctrine of the Roman Church, designated as the *Mother Church*, and the Pope, under the title of *Patriarch of the West*. The two universities were recommended to prefer, in their lessons, the authority of the ancient fathers to that of the first reformers. All these circumstances, and several others, gave a foretaste of reunion and one would like to have seen the Holy See use these circumstances to bring it nearer".¹

The fate of the Church under the Commonwealth effectively put a stop to any results that might have come from these negotiations.

The end of the seventeenth century saw many proposals for reunion with the rest of the Western Church. Charles II appears to have sought the formation of a Uniate Church, and although Protestant suspicion was much inflamed by these negotiations, which proceeded from 1663 to the end of the Stuart dynasty, yet Wickham Legg is able to say with truth that "about this time there seems to have been in certain quarters a movement towards reunion with Rome, and a tendency to consider the question how far the doctrines of the two Communions could be reconciled".² A number of books and pamphlets were published on the subject.³

With the accession of William and Mary the condition of things changed. The best of the "High-Church" clergy—successors of the Caroline divines—refused to take the oath of allegiance and left, or were ejected from, the State Church. These Non-jurors, however, carried with them the Caroline unionist tradition, though they modified its details. They were compelled by their position to examine with care the nature of schism, and consequently to evolve a coherent conception of the doctrine of the Church in regard to it. Thus they corrected the comparative laxity of some of the Caroline divines in the matter of schismatic ordinations, while at the same time evolving a clear doctrine of Catholic unity.⁴ Because James II and his descendants were Roman

¹ *Histoire critique des Projets formés depuis trois cents ans pour la Réunion des communions chrétiennes*, pp. 261–262.

² *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement*, p. 406.

³ An account of some of these books is in Legg, *op. cit.*, pp. 408 ff. A fuller account is in Tabaraud, *op. cit. passim*. The particular value of which work is the excellent number of *précis* given of books and schemes for reunion now lost or forgotten.

⁴ Probably the best statement of their position is in Bishop George Hickes' *The Constitution of the Catholic Church and the Nature and Consequences of Schism* (printed without name of publisher or place of publication, 1716), a book, unhappily, of extreme rarity.

Catholics, it was inevitable that the Non-jurors, who were staunch Jacobites by virtue of their position, should be suspected of "Romanism". But although one finds in their writings, on the whole, a more lofty conception of Roman Catholicism than was common at the time, and a general absence of bitterness, yet they appear to have been quite without thoughts of union with Rome. With the Eastern Church, however, matters were different, and the Non-jurors entered into definite negotiations with it. Several Orthodox prelates visited England in the early years of the eighteenth century, and in 1716 came the Metropolitan Arsenius of Thebais, and with him the Non-jurors entered into a correspondence with a view to a "Concordate". The correspondence was somewhat intricate and protracted, and the Ecumenical Patriarch became involved in it. The Easterns appear to have been under the impression that they were treating with the English episcopate, (probably misled by the somewhat grandiloquent titles assumed by the Non-jurors). In 1718 Archbishop Wake of Canterbury wrote to the Ecumenical Patriarch informing him of the position, and although the correspondence continued for several more years, the Easterns had become definitely less cordial.¹ But Wake, while discouraging the correspondence with the Non-jurors, yet "regards the existing relations of the Anglican and Eastern Church as most intimate,"² while in his letter to the Ecumenical Patriarchs he said: "Meanwhile we, the true Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England, as, in every fundamental article we profess the same faith with you, should not cease, at least in spirit and effect (since otherwise, owing to our distance from you we cannot), to hold communion with you, and to pray for your peace and happiness."³

The Non-jurors were important, however, because, to quote the words of Dr. Brilioth, "within the party were preserved the principles and Church usages which the rest of the Church abandoned, and which during the Renaissance of the nineteenth century came into honour again as constituents of the inheritance of primitive doctrine and practice which were then revived".⁴ The Non-juring succession did not die out until 1779, while the

¹ The correspondence is published in full in Williams, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century*.

² Williams, *op. cit.*, p. xxxix.

³ *Ibid.*, p. lviii.

⁴ *The Anglican Revival*, p. 18.

irregular succession continued until 1805,¹ so that their influence extended to the very beginning of the Tractarian period itself. In calling the Church of England back to a realization of her true nature, the Tractarians were carrying on the tradition of the Caroline divines transmitted to them *via* the Non-jurors.

The beginning of the eighteenth century also saw certain reunion activities within the Established Church. The best known of these is the correspondence between Archbishop Wake and certain doctors of the Sorbonne relative to union between the Anglican and Gallican churches. The correspondence was initiated from the French side through the Rev. William Beauvoir, Chaplain to the British Embassy in Paris. Wake, having been a "Low Churchman", was at this time (1717) a moderate "High Churchman", but in the correspondence he showed himself singularly stiff and unyielding. As a negotiation towards reunion the whole affair was somewhat unfortunate, and later historians have been wont to attach more importance to it than it really deserves. Those on the French side were men opposed to the Bull *Unigenitus*, which condemned the Jansenists, though they were themselves unaffected by the Jansenist heresy, while Wake treated with them only as men in opposition to Rome, and, indeed, he said, "nothing can be done to any purpose in this case but by throwing off the Pope's authority".² The only men who came at all well out of the business were the doctors of the Sorbonne, Du Pin and Girardin. "It may be doubted", says J. D. Chambers, "whether Wake was ever really in earnest in the matter, for he employs himself more in lecturing Dupin and the Sorbonne than in settling the terms of union."³ Beauvoir, who acted as intermediary for most of the business, appears throughout to have had an eye on preferment,⁴ while the Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal de Noailles, kept well in the background and, though he had a taste for such correspondences,⁵ never personally addressed himself to Wake (to the latter's manifest annoyance), and appears not to have been at all in earnest.

¹ The story of the last years of the Non-juring movement is told fully in *The Later Non-Jurors* by Henry Broxap.

² Lupton, *Archbishop Wake and the Project of Union*, p. 89. This book contains the fullest account of the affair.

³ *Some Account of Former Attempts towards the Reunion of Christendom*, p. 43.

⁴ Lupton, *op. cit.*, p. 83 n.

⁵ E.g., his curious correspondence with Count Zinzendorf, see *La Catholique du Monde chrétien d'après la Correspondence inédite du Comte Louis de Zinzendorf avec le Cardinal de Noailles . . . 1719-1728*.

The eighteenth century was the "dark night" of the Church of England, and although the Non-jurors kept alive the little flame of Catholic piety which must instinctively lighten a desire for union with the rest of Catholic Christendom, Eastern and Western, their prevailing Jacobitism made them generally suspected, so that their influence, though notable in individual cases, was insufficient to counteract effectively the increasingly insular and schismatic character of Anglican thought. To temper this feeling, however, there was towards the end of the century an outside influence at work in a growing feeling of sympathy for the Catholics of France in the attacks they were suffering from anti-clerical philosophers. "Far from doing harm to religious truth, the attacks of the philosophers tended even to save it in England. They tempered the extreme warmth of Protestant zeal and made men reflect upon the persecutions which for two centuries had raged against the Catholics. In the end, in this country, men came to recognize the injustice of the treatment to which Catholics had been submitted, and thus spirits were prepared for that tolerance which England was soon to practise."¹

In 1778, through the influence of George Savile, the Bill of Toleration allowed Roman Catholics in England to practise their religion under certain restrictions. Unhappily, however, the Nonconformists, who had been free to practise their religion since 1688, had no intention that the same freedom should be extended to Catholics, and it is to the Methodists primarily that the revival of anti-papal feeling was due. It is they who were the principal instigators of the Gordon Riots of 1780. "These sectaries said that Catholics were the enemies of all Protestant governments, that they should not be trusted, even though they had taken the oath demanded by the Bill [Bill of Toleration of May 25th, 1778] because they could be released by the Pope, even though they had sworn he had not the power to do it."²

In spite of this anti-papal feeling, which at this period was less strong within the Established Church than is generally supposed, the nation responded nobly to the cries of distress of

¹ F.-X. Plasse, *Le Clergé Français Réfugié en Angleterre*, pp. 10-11.

² F. C. Husenbeth, *Life of the Right Rev. John Milner*, p. 11. See Ward, *Prelude to Catholic Emancipation*. The best account of the Gordon Riots is that by Mr. J. P. de Castro.

the French clergy who, in 1792, were forced either to go into exile or to take oaths compromising their consciences. Altogether some eight thousand of these refugee clergy and bishops found their way to England during that year, and excited throughout the land not only sympathy for suffering patiently borne, but also admiration for their piety and austerity of life. The influence of these priests was considerable. Within a very short space of time the mob-hatred inflamed by the unhappy Lord George Gordon was obliterated. "That upheaval [the French Revolution]", says Canon Ollard, "brought to this country hundreds of *émigrés*, priests and lay people, and Englishmen suddenly awoke to the fact that neither Roman Catholics nor Frenchmen were as black and as bad as they had supposed."¹ "None are more entitled to our offices of love", wrote Bishop Horsley of St. Asaph, "than these venerable exiles and clergy of the fallen Church of France, endeared to us by the edifying example they exhibit of suffering for conscience sake."

"For myself," wrote Dr. F. G. Lee, whose grandfather had been active in helping the exiles, "I gladly believe that the words and works of several of the *émigrés* who later became librarians, founders of Catholic missions,² as well as teachers of foreign languages, and remained in England, helped largely to bring about the Oxford Movement of Newman and Keble in the year 1833."³

The reunion prospect, then, at the beginning of the nineteenth century was not as black as the state of the Church of England might lead one to suppose. In 1810 the aged Bishop of Durham, Dr. Shute Barrington, delivered his famous Charge entitled, *Grounds of Union between the Churches of England and Rome considered, in a Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Durham*. Canon Ollard, following G. W. E. Russell, describes Dr. Barrington as an Evangelical,⁴ but he appears to have developed into a moderate "High Churchman". In 1806 he delivered a Charge to his clergy entitled *The Grounds on which the Church of England*

¹ *Reunion*, p. 25.

² In fact few of the refugee clergy founded missions and few even worked in them; Canon Plasse identifies few so employed and their names rarely occur in J. O. Payne's *Old English Catholic Missions* where the names of the founders of most of the missions extant at this period are given. Most of the refugees became either librarians or tutors in Roman Catholic families.

³ Art. "The French *Émigrés* in Oxfordshire", in *Ave Maria*, July 21, 1900.

⁴ *Reunion*, p. 26, quoting Russell, *Short History of the Evangelical Movement*, p. 23.

separated from the *Church of Rome*,¹ in which he appears to have been far from any thought of union: "The reasons for our separation from the *Church of Rome* rest not in trifling concerns of external discipline, but on points essential to the purity of the Christian Faith, or highly important to the interests of morality, and the due advancement of religious knowledge."² The "overthrow of the antient government of France, and all its tremendous consequences" he attributes there "to the corruptions of the *Church of Rome*".³ Four years later his tone has quite changed. He now asks "what public duty of greater magnitude can present itself to us, than the restoration of peace and union to the *Church* by the reconciliation of two so large portions of it, as the *Churches of England and Rome*? What undertaking of more importance and higher interest can employ the piety and learning of the ministers of Christ, than the endeavour to accomplish this truly Christian work?"⁴ Dr. Barrington had been one of those active in assisting the refugee clergy, and it is likely that their influence was effective in producing this change of tone.

In 1818 another Anglican reunionist entered the field. This was the Rev. Samuel Wix, Vicar of St. Bartholomew the Less, London, an F.R.S. and an F.S.A.⁵ In 1808 Wix had published a book on the Thirty-nine Articles, "affectionately intended to promote religious Peace and Unity", and in 1818 he published *Reflections concerning the Expediency of a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome being holden, with a view to accommodate Religious Differences*. A few extracts from this work will serve to make clear Wix's main plea: "Acknowledging as the *Church of England* does, the authority of the *Church of Rome*, by admitting of her ordinations, insomuch that, on the recantation of certain opinions, a priest of the *Church of Rome* may be licensed by the bishop to officiate in the *Church of England*, and to enjoy her preferments; and agreeing, too, as the *Church of England* does, with the *Church of Rome* in the main articles of faith professed by her, it would appear that the sacrifices on the part of the *Church of England* are not likely to

¹ An article in *The Pilot*, March 1939, entitles this Charge *On the Nature of Spiritual Religion*; I have not seen a copy so entitled, I quote from the edition of 1815.

² Charge of 1806, p. 10.

⁴ Charge of 1810, pp. 11-12 (ed. of 1811).

⁵ For Wix, see his life in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

be of that serious nature that should deter from the union that is so much desired. . . . Should the Council ever be called, the power which the Pope ought to maintain in the Christian Church, in primacy of order, might be discussed. The Church of England does not deny the authority of the Pope; she reckons him among the senior bishops of the Church of Christ, though she deprecates the exercise of any jurisdiction of his Holiness within these realms. This is an important subject which might well come before the Council, and which might be managed to the satisfaction of both the Roman Church and the Church of England. . . . No solid objection prevails against the Church of England attempting a union with the Church of Rome; since the Church of Rome is acknowledged by the Church of England to be a true apostolical Church.”¹

This pamphlet produced an angry reply from Thomas Burgess, Bishop of St. David’s,² to whom Wix wrote two temperate replies, in the first of which he explained away some of his assertions: “The Author repeats, that his object was not, in the first instance, union with the Church of Rome. It was to invite consideration as to the expediency of a Council to consider whether anything could be done to promote the renunciation of Papal errors, as the means of a truly Christian union . . . for union was no otherwise recommended than upon the renunciation of errors and delusions on the part of the Romanists; this was the means by which it was hoped union might be obtained and schism restrained.”³ This was something of a recantation; on the other hand, the position is not far removed from that of Newman in 1841.

Six years after Wix’s pamphlets came a remarkable overture from the Roman side in the shape of a letter written by the Roman Catholic Bishop Doyle, of Kildare and Leighlin, to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, “On the Union of the Churches”.⁴ His biographer tells us that “the broken unity of the Church afflicted Dr. Doyle exceedingly; and from the days of his child-

¹ Pp. v, xxiv–xxv, 28.

² It is interesting to note that Burgess had been appointed examining chaplain to Dr. Shute Barrington when Bishop of Salisbury in 1785 and moved with him to Durham in 1791.

³ *Letter to the Bishop of St. David’s occasioned by his Lordship’s Misconceptions and Misrepresentations of a Pamphlet entitled: Reflections, &c. . . .* p. 19.

⁴ The Letter first appeared in the *Dublin Evening Post*, May 22, 1824; it is printed in full as an appendix to Oxenham, *An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century*.

hood many a fervent prayer ascended from his lips, that God would be pleased to reunite the divided Churches”.¹ The immediate occasion of Dr. Doyle’s Letter was a speech on reunion made in the House of Commons by a Mr. Robertson (whom Dr. Doyle appears to confuse with Mr. Robinson, since the latter took no part in the debate). “This union,” says the Bishop, “on which so much depends, is not, as you have justly observed, so difficult as appears to many; and the present time is peculiarly well calculated for attempting, at least, to carry it into effect. It is not difficult; for in the discussions which were held, and the correspondence which occurred on this subject early in the last century, as well as that in which Archbishop Wake was engaged, as the others which were carried on between Leibnitz and Bossuet,² it appeared that the points of agreement between the Churches were numerous, those on which the parties hesitated few, and apparently not the most important. . . . The Catholic laity (in Ireland) . . . are tired of their degradation; they are wearied in pursuit of freedom; they love their country, and are anxious for repose. Their clergy, without, I believe, an exception, would make every possible sacrifice to effect a Union; I myself would most cheerfully, and without fee, pension, emolument, or hope, resign the office which I hold, if by so doing I could in any way contribute to the union of my brethren and the happiness of my country.”³

Unhappily Dr. Doyle’s Letter was ignored by the Church of England, with the exception of one or two individuals, and it gave little satisfaction to Roman Catholics. “Had the same peculiar religious opinions prevailed in 1824 which have, of late years, characterized the Anglican Church”, says Mr. Fitzpatrick, “a louder and more cordial response would doubtless have been given to Dr. Doyle’s overture.”⁴

So the stage was set for that revival within the Church of England which has done so much to make the eleven decades since 1833 the period of most intense reunion activity which Christendom has seen.

That reunion activity was primarily the work of the followers of

¹ Fitzpatrick, *Life, Times and Correspondence of Dr. Doyle*, vol. I, pp. 320–321.

² The literature on the Leibnitz–Bossuet correspondence is considerable; the more important titles are enumerated in H. R. T. Brandreth, *Unity and Reunion: A Bibliography*, pp. 45–46.

³ Oxenham, *op. cit.*, pp. 322–323.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 326.

the Oxford Movement. The Church of England in the early years of the nineteenth century had begun to waken from that torpor which had characterized her during the eighteenth. New forces were stirring several decades before the first of the *Tracts for the Times* in August, 1833; forces which were destined to renew within the national Church that life and vigour which at one time had been so conspicuous in her. In the early years of the century the most prominent of these forces was the Evangelical Movement. This movement, however, was primarily aimed at the increase of personal religion and devotion. "Evangelicalism was the religion of the home," says Canon Charles Smyth, in the best modern study of the movement, "and in the revival of family worship it won the most signal and the most gracious of its triumphs."¹ Valuable as that witness undoubtedly was, it had not within it the seeds of a strong ecumenical consciousness.

The other force which was awakening to new life was the old High Church party. It was this party which directly gave birth to the Oxford Movement and, indeed, the Oxford Movement at its beginning was but the flowering into life of the High Church party. The High Church leader of the 1820's was Hugh James Rose, whom his biographer has with justice acclaimed as "the restorer of the old paths".² Dean Burgon claims that "if to any one man is to be assigned the honour of having originated the great Catholic Revival of our times, that man was Hugh James Rose".³

Rose was not alone as a restorer of old paths; of almost equal influence was Dr. Charles Lloyd, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford and later Bishop of that diocese. At the feet of Dr. Lloyd sat Newman, Pusey, Hurrell Froude, William Palmer of Worcester College, Isaac Williams and Frederick Oakeley. Dr. Lloyd was a High Churchman who had had many contacts with the French refugees. "I do remember to have received from him", says Oakeley, "an entirely new notion of Catholics and Catholic doctrine."⁴ It is probable, too, that the pre-Tractarian High Church Revival in the American Church was not without its influence in this country, and Rose, in particular, had

¹ *Simeon and Church Order*, p. 20.

² Burgon, *Lives of Twelve Good Men*, I, pp. 116 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 158.

⁴ *Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement*, p. 13.

contacts with it through George Washington Doane, Bishop of New Jersey.

This revival of the old High Church tradition had within it the seeds of a true ecumenical consciousness, insisting, as it did, upon the doctrine of the Church and the meaning of Churchmanship. As it developed into the Tractarian Movement so the seeds of this consciousness began to flower.

II

THE EARLY TRACTARIANS

IT would be a mistake to regard the Oxford Movement at its inception as a consciously unionist movement. It must be remembered that to John Keble when he preached his famous Assize Sermon on "National Apostasy" on July 14th, 1833, which is reckoned as the inauguration of the Movement, the Catholic Emancipation of four years earlier was every bit as much a part of a "national apostasy" as the abolition by Parliament of certain Irish bishoprics or the abolition of the Test and Corporation Acts. The early *Tracts*, moreover, were consciously anti-Roman, though towards their close something of an eirenic spirit began to make itself felt, and *Tract XC*, which the other Tractarians upheld, was at least eirenic in intention. "On the surface", says Archdeacon C. P. S. Clarke, "the professed aim of the Tracts, to combat 'Popery and Dissent', was hardly a promising basis for reunion. But the direction the Movement took from the very first in insisting on Catholicity was bound to promote reunion, as indeed it has."¹

Throughout the history of the Movement we may trace three distinct schools of thought on the Anglican side with regard to reunion with Rome. There were those like Dr. Pusey, who, from the time of Newman's secession to Rome in 1845, until his own death in 1882, was the acknowledged leader of the Anglican Catholic party, and later Lord Halifax, who succeeded Pusey as leader, who actively sought grounds of union; then, again, there were those like W. G. Ward and Frederick Oakeley, who believed that the basis was there in a complete acceptance of the Roman position and who, when they found that view seriously opposed, made their own individual submissions to the Holy See; lastly, there were those like William Palmer of Worcester College, Oxford, who, while being actively concerned in the Movement, were bitterly hostile to Rome, and their successors in the ritualistic anti-papal school of Dr. R. F. Littledale and Charles Gutch. On the Roman side there were men like Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle, who spent his life in the cause of corporate

¹ C. P. S. Clarke, *The Oxford Movement and After*, p. 296.

reunion, and Cardinal Wiseman, who, though naturally more cautious, showed at least a desire to follow de Lisle; opposed to them were the Ultramontane school of Manning and W. G. Ward,¹ who regarded the longing for corporate reunion as an idle, and even a sinful, dream.

Rome, however, was a constant, if little-known, factor ever in the minds of the Tractarians. Few of the responsible leaders of the Movement were disposed to go far with W. G. Ward in the propositions put forward in his famous *Ideal of a Christian Church*, wherein he claimed the right to hold all Roman doctrine while remaining an Anglican, and in his two pamphlets in defence of *Tract XC*. Their immediate aim was strictly insular in intention—the defence of *Ecclesia Anglicana*. "It began in a spirit of the most loyal Anglicanism evoked by the successful attacks of the Protestant sectaries and the Roman Catholics, aided by a Liberalist Government, upon the Established Church," wrote William Palmer of Magdalen College to the Russian theologian Khomiakoff. "It proceeded up to a certain point, in a spirit of resolute hostility to Popery no less than to Sectarianism."² But if the responsible leaders were slow to follow W. G. Ward, they showed themselves equally slow at following William Palmer of Worcester College, who, in a fanatical hatred and fear of all things Roman, wrote to Dr. Wiseman: "If, therefore, as is reported, you have received the form of episcopal consecration at Rome, this does not prove you to be a bishop, or excuse you for exercising episcopal or sacerdotal functions without the licence, and in opposition to the authority, of your legitimate Diocesan, the Bishop of Worcester; an offence which subjects you to deposition and excommunication by the Canons received by the whole Catholic Church."³

Palmer was a formidable opponent of all would-be "Romanizers", but he was not a representative Tractarian, and in the Preface to his *Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times* he asserts that the publication of the Tracts was the more immediate concern of his colleagues,⁴ and throughout that pamphlet he takes care to distinguish between his own work and that of the Tractarians. He was a High Churchman

¹ Ward seceded to Rome in 1845 and Manning in 1851.

² Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, p. 22.

³ A Letter to N. Wiseman, D.D. (calling himself Bishop of Melipotamus), p. 4. A considerable pamphlet controversy ensued in which, if good manners and Christian charity count for anything, the advantage was with the Romans.

⁴ 1st ed., pp. vii-viii.

of the traditional, anti-Non-juring type, and when a divergence began to appear between the Oxford school and the old High-Church school, Palmer remained with the latter. His *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, published in 1838, is the classic exposition of this school of thought, and was described by Dean Church as "an honour to English theology and learning".

In 1841 appeared number Ninety of the *Tracts for the Times*, entitled *Remarks on certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles*, written, but not signed, by Newman. In this tract he set out to show that "while our Prayer Book is acknowledged on all hands to be of Catholic origin, our Articles also, the offspring of an uncatholic age, are, through God's good providence, to say the least, not uncatholic, and may be subscribed by those who aim at being Catholic in heart and doctrine".¹ Throughout this Tract Newman sought to show that the doctrine of the Thirty-nine Articles was not repugnant to official Roman doctrine. This, of course, made it necessary that the other Tractarians should, at least in some measure, define their attitude towards the Church of Rome. In the main their position is summed up by Newman in the explanation he wrote to Bishop Bagot: "I do not wonder that persons who happen to fall upon certain writings of mine, and are unacquainted with others, and, as is natural, do not understand the sense in which I use certain words and phrases, should think that I explain away the differences between the Roman system and our own, which I hope I do not. They find in what I have written, no abuse, at least I trust not, of the individual Roman Catholic, nor of the Church of Rome, viewed abstractly as a Church. I cannot speak against the Church of Rome, viewed in her formal character, as a true Church, since she is 'built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Cornerstone'. Nor can I speak against her private members, numbers of whom, I trust, are God's people, in the way to Heaven, and one with us in heart, though not in profession. But what I have spoken, and do strongly speak against is, that energetic system and engrossing influence in the Church by which it acts towards us, and meets our eyes, like a cloud filling it, to the eclipse of all that is holy, whether in its ordinances or its members. This system I have called in what I have written, Romanism or

¹ 1st ed., p. 4.

Popery, and by Romanists or Papists I mean all its members, so far as they are under the power of these principles; and while, and so far as this system exists, and it does exist now as fully as heretofore, I say that we can have no peace with that Church, however we may secretly love its particular members. . . . I wish from my heart we and they were one; but we cannot, without sin, sacrifice truth to peace; and, in the words of Archbishop Laud, 'till Rome be other than it is' we must be estranged from her. This view . . . presents her under a twofold aspect, and while recognizing her as an appointment of God on the one hand, it leads us practically to shun her, as beset with heinous and dangerous influences on the other."¹

Dean Church, our surest guide to this period of the Movement, sums up Newman's position at this time as follows: "What now presented itself to Mr. Newman's thoughts, instead of the old notion of a pure Church on one side, and a corrupt Church on the other, sharply opposed to one another, was the more reasonable supposition of two great portions of the divided Church, each with its realities of history and fact and character, each with its special claims and excellencies, each with its special sins and corruptions, and neither realising in practice and fact all that it professed to be on paper; each of which further, in the conflicts of past days, had deeply, almost unpardonably, wronged the other."²

This conception of the "two Romes"—that of a popular and corrupt traditional system on the one hand, which was utterly alien from Anglicanism, and that of the Councils and official formularies on the other which was not so far removed from it—was largely accepted by the more central school of the Tractarians. It was a conception which, as Newman pointed out, went behind the Tractarians themselves to a review which Bishop Lloyd of Oxford wrote in the *British Critic* in 1825³ and behind Dr. Lloyd to various of the post-Reformation Anglican divines.⁴ This view also found support in the American Church. Bishop Onderdonk of New York said of the Oxford divines, in his Convention address of 1841: "They would distinguish popery, not from Protestantism—for that is a most heterogeneous mass—

¹ *A Letter to the Right Reverend Father in God, Richard, Lord Bishop of Oxford, on the Occasion of No. 90 in the Series called The Tracts for the Times*, pp. 20-21.

² *The Oxford Movement* (3rd ed.), p. 207.

³ *A Letter addressed to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D.D. . . . In Explanation of No. 90 of the Series called The Tracts for the Times*, p. 10.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

but from scriptural and primitive Catholicity. Here they look for the Christian system in its integrity. They wish not to allow the Church of Rome the false boast that her popish peculiarities are Catholic. They wish to remove from Protestants the miserable and suicidal delusion, that all that is opposed to Rome is therefore true, and to enable them to separate what in the present Romish system is retained of Catholic verity from what of papal error is mingled with it.”¹

Pusey, in the Preface to the edition of *Tract XC* which he published in 1865, said that, “the general principle, that the Articles were directed, not against the Council of Trent, but against the popular system, had long been familiar to my mind”.² He was to repeat it more than twenty years after *Tract XC* in his first *Eirenicon*. On the other hand, Pusey had certainly not worked out his position so fully in 1841; in his Letter to Dr. Jelf he very roundly condemned the corruptions of popular Romanism without proceeding to deal with the more sober position of her formularies and councils. In a very fine passage at the close of this Letter, however, he summed up the whole Tractarian attitude to the reunion question, though he was destined later somewhat to revise his view on certain details: “It may be long ere the issue comes; at present, the course pointed out to the several Churches seems to be to amend themselves, to become again what they once were, even though imperfect; to ‘return to their first deeds’; so may they, through repentance and amendment of life, and keeping the commandments, be led to further knowledge of the truth, and in the end be restored to unity, if this blessing be yet in store for the Church. At least such seems the course which things, under God’s guidance, are taking. Thus even the Greek Church is again become proselytizing; the Gallican Church is sending out missionaries and praying for our conversion, shewing her new life, in part, in seeking to extend her own communion; in Prussia, religion is reviving in connection with Lutheran doctrine; we are being guided back to the principles of our Church; we seem thus to be taught, as our friend [Newman] concisely said, that ‘we are to go back, not to go over’; repentance and zeal must come first, union afterwards; union is to be

¹ Quoted in art. “Benjamin Tredwell Onderdonk, Fourth Bishop of New York”, by E. Clowes Chorley, in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, vol. IX, p. 10.

² Preface, p. xxv.

looked for, as God’s gift, to be prayed for, not compassed by man’s device; ‘it is God that maketh men to be of one mind in an house’: our duties then lie not now towards Rome; our present path and duties are plain;—with ourselves; to fit ourselves to be His instrument: how we may be employed, when fitted, we cannot foresee and so should not forestall; it may be that our first office will be, not with Rome, but with those bodies which were separated from Rome at the same time as ourselves, but were not so signally blessed and preserved; it may be, that through us what is lacking in them to the full gifts of a Church is to be supplied; it may be, that ‘our light shining before men’, they are thus to be led to ‘glorify our Father which is in Heaven’; and thus we may be reunited with the rest of Christendom, not alone nor selfishly, but decked with the rich jewelry of them whom we have won back to Primitive Faith and Discipline. . . . Our office then is with ourselves and within ourselves, ready to do acts of charity to those severed from us, as far as we may without compromise, but not seeking untimely union.”¹

So the aim is still insular, though those within the island are beginning to look outward; insularity is to be cultivated only in order that the various Churches may thereby prepare themselves for ultimate union.

As Dr. Cross has pointed out,² Keble’s attitude is less easy to discover. More than once he expressed himself as ignorant of the points at issue, and in a letter to Pusey, written just after Newman’s secession, he speaks of “neutrality towards Rome being our natural position”.³ On the other hand, in his tract *The Case of Catholic Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles considered* he expresses himself as distressed at the handle which will be given to Rome by the condemnation of *Tract XC*: “Hitherto, in all essential points, the followers of antiquity among us have challenged the Roman Catholics to prove our formularies wrong: it has been constantly said, ‘Rome must move towards us in the first instance, if ever a re-union is to take place’. But now it will be quite obvious, that we too shall have to retrace our steps. . . . As we have in former days surrendered to them the name Catholic, so we should now, by a kind of fatality, be conceding

¹ *The Articles treated on in Tract 90 reconsidered and their Interpretation vindicated in a Letter to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D.D.*, pp. 181–183.

² *The Tractarians and Roman Catholicism*, p. 18.

³ Liddon, *Life of . . . Pusey*, vol. II, p. 464.

the thing itself, and that at the very point of time when people gradually are beginning to be aware of its importance. There is no need to enlarge on the scandal which this would cause to our English Romanists, encouraging them to continue in their schism; and to Roman Catholics abroad, causing them to think and speak more harshly than ever of our branch of the Church.”¹

Of the other Tractarians, Isaac Williams considered that “if our own Church improved, as we hoped, and the Church of Rome also would reform itself, it seemed to hold out the prospect of reunion”.² The “reforms” which Williams desired, however, were no doubt considerable, since his *Autobiography* shows him as definitely anti-Roman. A. P. Perceval, the author of *Tracts 35* and *36*, is said by Dr. Cross to have been “more sympathetic in his attitude to Rome than most of the original Tractarians”.³ This opinion Dr. Cross bases on the inclusion by Perceval in his well-known *Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833* of two letters by pre-Tractarian Scottish bishops (Walker and Jolly) in which they speak hopefully of reunion with Rome. “The fact that Perceval quoted them with approval”, says Dr. Cross, “is an indication of his own attitude towards Rome. The desire for reunion with Rome expressed in them anticipated the feelings of the ‘Romanizing’ party, represented at a much later date by Ward and Oakeley.”⁴ But in the chapter “On the Interpretation of the XXXIX Articles” in this work Perceval says: “There are more of the ancient and exploded heresies revived and maintained in the Church of Rome than in any other body of Christians, which retains episcopal orders. More in number, I mean, not worse in kind. . . . But in extent of defiance of the decrees of the Catholic Church, in putting forth, as terms of communion, additions to the Catholic Creed, they of Rome are without a parallel.”⁵ Again, the Postscript to his *Vindication of the Principles of the Authors of ‘The Tracts for the Times’*, published two years before the *Collection of Papers*, is a piece of vigorous anti-Roman polemic.

In speaking of Richard Hurrell Froude we are on much more

¹ P. 32. I quote from the rare privately printed edition.

² *Autobiography*, p. 110.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁵ *Collection of Papers*, p. 94 (2nd ed.).

difficult ground, owing to the fact that the main source of our knowledge of him is the bewildering kaleidoscope of the *Remains*. His Roman Catholic biographer, Miss Guiney, suggests that the “Romanizing” party of Ward, Oakeley and Dalgairns was “the true and immediate seed of Hurrell Froude”.¹ None of these, however, could have written the words which Froude wrote on April 13th, 1833: “But we found to our horror that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church made the acts of each successive Council obligatory for ever, that what had been once decided could never be meddled with again; in fact, they were committed finally and irrevocably, and could not advance one step to meet us, even though the Church of England should become again what it was in Laud’s time, or indeed what it may have been up to the atrocious Council (of Trent), for M admitted that many things, e.g., the doctrines of Mass, which were fixed then, had been indeterminate before.

“So much for the Council of Trent, for which Christendom has to thank Luther and the Reformers. (Newman) declares that ever since I heard this I have become a staunch Protestant, which is a most base calumny on his part, though I own it has altogether changed my notions of the Roman Catholics, and made me wish for the total overthrow of their system. I think that the only *τόπος* now is ‘the ancient Church of England’, and as an explanation of what one means, ‘Charles the First and the Non-jurors’.”²

But Froude’s mind was darting about and was forcing contradictory issues on those around him while, as it seems, seeking his own firm ground. Less than a year after the passage quoted above he was able to write: “It seems to me plain that in all matters that seem to us indifferent or even doubtful, we should conform our practices to those of the Church which has preserved its traditional practices unbroken. We cannot know about any seemingly indifferent practice of the Church of Rome that is not a development of the apostolic *ἡθος*; and it is to no purpose to say that we can find no proof of it in the writings of the first six centuries; they must find a disproof if they would do anything.”³

Froude’s *Remains* are still a favourite quarrying-place for those who seek to prove, whether with approval or disapproval, that

¹ *Hurrell Froude*, pp. 225-226.

² *Remains*, vol. I, pp. 307-308.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 336.

the early Tractarian leaders were consciously directing the Movement towards Rome. Such a use of the book is quite unwarranted. Even if Miss Guiney's case be true that he was the inspiration of the "Romanizing" party, her further suggestion that he would have followed them finds no support in the *Remains*. The Oxford Movement moved, and most of the Tractarians moved with it; Froude's early death prevented his moving with them, and it is quite impossible to say what his final and considered opinion upon such questions might have been.

So to the early Tractarians Rome, at least as they saw her in her outward and practical system, appeared largely as something to be avoided. This was inevitable for several reasons. Primarily it was due to the need which the Tractarians saw of recalling the Church of England to a realization of her own Catholic heritage—a heritage which was essentially English, and which had little within it of the practical system of Roman thought and devotion as evolved in the centuries which succeeded the Council of Trent. But it was the popular system, lying alongside, or even overlaying, the more sober conciliar definitions, that the Tractarians attacked. Their appeal was to primitive antiquity, and in so far as that was the appeal also of the Church of Rome, they were at one with her; the popular system was attacked because it was modern, and therefore in their eyes uncatholic. It must be remembered, moreover, that there was a very general ignorance concerning all things Roman, and this was at least one of the reasons, in the early days, for the practical ignoring of the English Roman Catholics. The testimony of Frederick Oakeley, given many years after his submission to Rome, is of interest on this point: "It must be very difficult for those who are sons of the Church not by adoption but by inheritance, to realize, even by a strong effort of imagination, the depth and extent of the ignorance which prevailed among members of the Anglican Establishment at the beginning of the Tractarian Movement with regard to the state and feelings of the Catholic community in England. It is no exaggeration to say that many of us knew far more about the manners and customs of the ancient Egyptians, or Scythian tribes, than of the character and doings of this portion of our fellow-countrymen. . . . This may serve to explain, what otherwise must seem so strange, the way in which during the early years of the Tracts the very existence of English Catholics appeared to be ignored in

the controversial literature of the period. The silence about them did not, I really believe, arise from any feeling of indifference or contempt: except only in the case of one of the Tract writers [Worcester Palmer], who never hesitated to avow these sentiments. It was much rather that they came in no one's path."¹

It appears to have been *Tract XC* which really brought the "Romanizing" party to the fore. "On us young men", wrote Father William Lockhart many years later, "*Tract 90* had the effect of strengthening greatly our convictions that the Church of Rome was right and the Church of England wrong."² A similar conviction appears to have lain behind W. G. Ward's two pamphlets in support of *Tract XC*, and it was stated yet more clearly three years later in his famous *Ideal of a Christian Church*, when he wrote: "For my own part, I think it would not be right to conceal, indeed I am anxious openly to express, my own most firm and undoubting conviction,—that were we, as a Church, to pursue such a line of conduct as has been here sketched, in proportion as we did so, we should be taught from above to discern and appreciate the plain marks of Divine wisdom and authority in the Roman Church, to repent in sorrow and bitterness of heart our great sin in deserting her communion, and to sue humbly at her feet for pardon and restoration."³

Frederick Oakeley, second only to Ward as leader of the "Romanizers", said very much the same thing when he wrote about the decision of a committee of bishops concerning Bishop Montague's *Apello Caesarem* in the reign of Charles I, that it "amounts, in fact, to something very like an *authoritative decision*, on the part of the then Church of England, *in favour* of the consistency of certain very close approximations to Roman doctrine, with the language of her formularies; such decision having been pronounced, after a careful deliberation, by a committee of Bishops, appointed by the king to represent the national Church".⁴ Dealing with the present position the same writer is even more explicit: "Whether it have arisen from the unwarrantable conduct of the Roman party in England, or from

¹ *Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement*, pp. 34-37.

² Art. "Cardinal Newman: A Retrospect of Fifty Years, by one of his oldest living Disciples", in *Paternoster Review*, October 1890.

³ p. 473.

⁴ *The Subject of Tract XC examined in Connection with the History of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 2.

the recollection of ancient grievances; or from the desire of obviating, at any rate, the suspicion of Popery, or from an inadequate estimate of the importance of Catholic unity, or from whatever other cause; certain it is, that some even of our greater divines are accustomed to speak of the Roman Church in terms which it is hard to reconcile with their very close approximation, in parts of their writings, to Roman doctrine. And one reason, perhaps, why persons are startled by attempts, such as that incidentally made in Tract 90, to harmonize parts of the Articles with the Decrees of Trent, is, that they derive their idea of our Church's position in respect of other branches of the Catholic Church, from the harsh and exclusive tone upon which many of her divines have been forced by circumstances, rather than from the actual amount of their testimony to Catholic Truth. It has not been unusual with us to speak almost as if *independence* were, *per se*, a greater boon to a Church, than oneness with the Catholic body; a sentiment, which appears to savour rather of Judaism, than of the gracious and comprehensive dispensation under which we live.”¹

In 1841, also, there appeared a remarkable letter in the French paper *L'Univers*, written anonymously by a member of the University of Oxford,² and appealing for sympathy in reunion work. “The eyes of all Christendom are at this moment turned to England, so long separated from the rest of Catholic Europe. Everywhere a presentiment is gone abroad that the hour of her reunion is at hand, and that this island, of old so fruitful in saints, is once more about to put forth fruits worthy of the martyrs who

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34.

² The authorship of this letter is generally attributed to W. G. Ward—e.g., by Mr. Wilfred Ward in his *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 187, where he says that the letter was written by Ward and translated into French by Dalgairns. Jules Gondon, on the other hand, writing in 1867, says: “Il n'y a plus inconvenient aujourd'hui à dire que cette lettre, dont on a contesté dans le temps l'authenticité, que l'on a prétendu n'avoir pas écrite par un membre de l'Université, avait pour auteur le Révérend M. Dalgairns.”—*De la Réunion de l'Eglise d'Angleterre protestante à l'Eglise catholique*, p. 193. While in an earlier anonymous work (whose authorship is attested by a presentation copy to Mr. Gladstone at St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden), written while the letter was still a matter of discussion in France, M. Gondon says: “Nous connaissons personnellement son auteur que nous avons eu l'honneur de voir à Oxford en 1842, et avec lequel nous nous sommes longuement entretenus des jugements divers portés sur cette lettre.”—*Du Mouvement religieux en Angleterre*, par un Catholique, p. 333. Gondon is almost certainly right in his ascription of the authorship. The whole subject of this letter is ably discussed in the appendix to Dr. Denis Gwynn's book, *Dominic Barberi*.

have watered it with their blood. And truly that this presentiment is not unfounded I shall prove to you by a detail of what is now passing in the University of Oxford, the heart of the Anglican Church.”¹ The letter then proceeds to speak at length on the subject of *Tract XC*.

With Ward was associated a small group of men who later, in various ways, achieved distinction in the Roman Catholic Church; Frederick Faber, J. D. Dalgairns, J. B. Morris and, later, Frederick Oakeley. “The tendency of this section of able men was unquestionably Romeward, almost from the beginning of their connexion with the Movement,” says Dean Church; “both the theory, and the actual system of Rome, so far as they understood it, had attractions for them which nothing else had.”²

In 1841, too, a notable contribution appeared from the Roman side in the shape of *A Letter on Catholic Unity addressed to the Right Hon. the Earl of Shrewsbury* by Dr. Wiseman, in which the Oxford Movement was viewed with considerable sympathy. In the course of this Letter Wiseman said: “That the feelings which have been expressed, in favour of a return to unity by the Anglican Church, are every day widely spreading and deeply sinking, no one who has means of judging, I think, can doubt. Those sentiments have a silent echo in hundreds of sympathizing bosoms, and they who receive them as sounds dear to them, are not idle in communicating their own thoughts to many more, over whom they have influence; and thus has a far more general sense been awakened, than appears at first sight, to the religious state of things. There are many evidences (which it would be hardly proper to detail) that Catholic feelings have penetrated deeper into society than at first one would suspect. Whole parishes have received the leaven, and it is fermenting; and places where it might least be expected, seem to have received it in more secret and mysterious ways.”³ In this Letter, also, the view of Newman and Sancta Clara on the XXXIX Articles was accepted: “Such interpretation may be given to the most difficult Articles”, wrote Wiseman, “as will strip them of all contradiction to the decrees of the Tridentine Synod. The same method may be pursued on other points; and much pain thus be spared to individuals, and much difficulty to the Church.”⁴

¹ *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 187.

² *The Oxford Movement*, 3rd ed., p. 239.

³ p. 21. ⁴ p. 38.

In later years, however, Wiseman wrote a *Memorandum* concerning this Letter in which he appears less cordial: "The object of this letter to the aforesaid Earl was to make the civil rulers see how they would gain not only glory for themselves, but also advantages for the nation, wasted as it is by intestine war of hostile sects, if they could bring this realm to religious unity. . . . He (the present writer) treated exclusively of a body of persons who were considering only how to prepare the nation for a still distant and perhaps impossible religious unity."¹

In another small work published in the same year Wiseman made plain his position in regard to the Anglican claim to Catholicity: "Let that Church, as a *Church*, detach itself from all other sectaries in its reasoning against us, let it avow disapprobation of their principles, let it be as unanimous in its doctrines concerning tradition and Church authority—we will not say as we are, but as it is itself on the rejection of Transubstantiation, and then we will acknowledge its right to record a separate plea from the great body of Protestants, when the Catholic arraigns them together for a breach of religious unity."²

Meanwhile another Roman Catholic champion of reunion was appearing on the scene, the distinguished layman Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle, a pre-Tractarian convert to Rome and founder of the Trappist monastery of Mount St. Bernard in Leicestershire. He started a long correspondence with Dr. J. R. Bloxam, Fellow of Magdalen College and from 1837-40 one of Newman's curates: "The Ambrose Phillipps letters in 1841 are respecting the possibility of a reunion of the Anglican and Roman Churches", wrote Bloxam to Dr. Lee many years later, "but when the net was thrown aside, and after two days fishing with a rod, Sibthorpe was hooked at Oscott,³ as unexpectedly by himself, as he told me, as a fish pulled out of the water, my correspondence on the subject of reunion ceased."⁴ But Bloxam had shown part of the correspondence to W. G. Ward, and later Ward and de Lisle⁵ met in

¹ Ward, *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, vol. II, p. 482.

² *High Church Claims*, p. 25.

³ For an account of Sibthorpe's conversion see *Richard Waldo Sibthorpe: A Biography*, by J. Fowler, ch. x.

⁴ MS. letter preserved at Magdalen College, Oxford. The correspondence referred to is preserved at Magdalen. Much of it is published in Middleton, *Cardinal Newman and Dr. Bloxam*.

⁵ Ambrose March Phillipps assumed the name of de Lisle on the death of his father in 1862; I have so called him here throughout, as it is the name by which he is best remembered.

Oxford: "Zeal for the reunion of Churches was on both sides a bond of sympathy, and the two men sat up half the night on their first introduction discussing the prospects of Christendom".¹ The correspondence between Ward and de Lisle was uninterrupted by Sibthorpe's conversion, and continued until Ward's own conversion. Later the two men drifted apart and became opponents in many matters. "No single individual has done more to bring this important question before members of his own and the Anglican Communion than that eminently respected layman, Mr. Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle of Leicestershire," wrote Dr. Lee.²

The storm of condemnation which had been aroused by *Tract XC* had gravely undermined Newman's belief in the Anglican position, and in October, 1845, he seceded to Rome. This more effectively put a stop to reunion advances for the next decade. In spite of the fact, however, that action was not taken, thought was busier than ever, and the way was being prepared, in the minds of the leaders of the Movement, for the definite action which was later to be initiated.

We have seen enough of the views of the leaders of Tractarian thought to realize that Jules Gondon was right when he wrote: "Unity! That is the hope of all the distinguished names which lead this movement or are associated with it. The isolation of their Church preoccupies and disquiets them."³ On the other hand, the leaders were quite convinced that their disquiet should not lead them to precipitate action. The formidable Dr. Close, Rector of Cheltenham, was quite justified, however, in saying that, "in 1833, when the Oxford Movement commenced, no one had ever heard of the smallest inclination towards Rome in the clergy or laity of the Church of England, much less in the students of our universities . . . and the bare possibility that in the space of ten years there should be such an extended inoculation of Romanism as now exists had occurred to no one."⁴ The principles of the Tractarians themselves did not, of course, tend to "Romanism" in the sense in which that word would to-day be used; they did tend to call the Church of England to a realization of her essential Catholicism, and, as such, they inevitably aroused

¹ *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 190.

² *Union Review*, vol. I, p. 27.

³ *De la Réunion de l'Eglise d'Angleterre protestante à l'Eglise catholique*, p. 157.

⁴ *The Tendency of "Church Principles", so called, to Romanism*, p. 11.

in the hearts of those who accepted them a longing for a union, when such might rightly be accomplished, with the major part of Western Catholicism and the efforts of the greatest leaders of the Movement were increasingly directed towards finding means for its accomplishment.

To the East also many of the early Tractarians turned their eyes. ". . . the Tractarian theory of the Church tended to promote intelligent enquiry into the nature of Christianity in the Orient; for the Catholic world was held to exist in three Branches, of which the Eastern was one. Again, it was desirable to seek friendly relations therewith, since that would have removed from the Church of England the reproach of isolation. Furthermore, it was natural that these two Churches should draw together, seeing that Rome excommunicated both alike, and that they in their turn agreed in rejecting the Papal claim of Supremacy."¹

The latter motive suggested here—namely, seeking union with the East in order to form a vast anti-papal bloc—does not, however, appear to have been present in the minds of the early Tractarians. Newman, indeed, at one period, as Professor Shaw points out, went to the opposite extreme, in criticizing the East because he believed that the Pope had exerted authority over the Greeks.² Dr. Pusey, writing in 1842 against the Jerusalem Bishopric, is outspoken in his desire for reunion with the East. He speaks strongly in condemnation of the C.M.S. for proselytizing among the Easterns: "But any attempts at 'conversion' or connivance in persons forsaking the orthodox communion in which they were baptized, besides encouraging sin, must immeasurably delay the prospect of union with that communion. . . . This reopened intercourse with the East is . . . a crisis in the history of our Church. It is a wave which may carry us onward, or, if we miss it, may bruise us sorely and fall on us, instead of landing us on the shore. The union or disunion of the Church for centuries may depend on the wisdom with which this providential opening is employed. If the ways which He makes for us are neglected, we may long essay in vain to attain in our own, what in His would have been easy, since He would 'make them plain before our face'. In proportion to the greatness of the blessing held out to us, must be our anxiety

¹ P. E. Shaw, *The Early Tractarians and the Eastern Church*, p. 76.

² *Ibid.*, p. 77.

lest we miss it. It stirs the heart and makes one, like Jacob, almost disbelieve for fear, that such an event as the reunion of our Church with a sound branch of the Church Catholic should be open to us; alas! considering what we actually are, it makes us fear lest it cannot be meant for us, and as though it were not in any temper which we can in this day claim, amid mutual self-complacency, but in weeping and sackcloth and ashes that the breaches of our brotherly union are to be healed."¹

Among the early followers of the Movement it was William Palmer of Magdalen College who became most nearly a phil-orthodox. "The most conspicuous instance of approach to the Eastern Church during the Tractarian period was due to the convictions of an individual who, though associated in a general way with the Oxford Movement, acted in this matter quite independently."² This incident was Palmer's visit to the Russian Church in 1840. "He was going", writes R. D. Middleton, "to claim admission to Communion, not as a convert to Orthodoxy, or as a seeder from the Church of England, but as a member of the Catholic Church of which he regarded the Russian as a true branch within its own territory."³ This plan had the approval of Dr. Routh of Magdalen. "He approved of my seeking communion," said Palmer, "saying also at the same time, 'It will do nothing, I fear, sir, for a separation there unhappily is; but it will show that there are some among us who wish it were otherwise.'"⁴ This immediate object of his visit was denied him by the authorities of the Russian Church, but he did gain much information about Orthodoxy in general, and the Russian Church in particular, and did, perhaps, do something to pave the way for later and more formal advances. Canon J. A. Douglas, however, correctly states that "he never understood the principles of Orthodoxy, and from first to last seems to have tried to make them fit with Papalist theories".⁵ This is borne out by

¹ *A Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury on some Circumstances connected with the present Crisis in the English Church*, pp. 95-96 (2nd ed.).

² Shaw, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

³ *Magdalen Studies*, p. 109; the chapter on Palmer in this book is quite the best account of him. Palmer left his recorded impressions of his visits to Russia to Cardinal Newman who published them in 1882 under the title *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church in the years 1840, 1841*. Palmer also wrote two books, *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Eastern Church* and *A Harmony of Anglican and Eastern Doctrine*, which are still of service.

⁴ *Notes of a Visit . . .*, p. 10.

⁵ *The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox*, p. 180 n.

the *Profession of Faith* which Palmer wrote for circulation among his friends when, in 1854, having received no satisfaction from the Orthodox authorities, he seceded to Rome: "And he [the writer] cannot deny that even when he felt himself obliged to seek admission to the Communion of the Greek or Eastern Church he dreaded rather than wished for success, while on the contrary, even when he was most fighting against Rome, his heart wished for the Roman Communion".¹ But even after his reception into the Roman Church he appears to have made one more attempt to join the Greek.²

His main contribution to the cause of reunion was that of forcing the subject of Eastern Orthodoxy upon the minds of several of the Tractarians and their followers, who, unhampered by his own somewhat peculiar theories as to the nature of the Catholic Church, were able to put his studies to a better use than he himself was able to do.

¹ Quoted, Birkbeck, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

² *Ibid.*, p. 185.

III

1857-1865

THE year 1857 is in several respects an important one in the history of Anglo-Roman reunion. It was in that year that Ambrose de Lisle published his famous pamphlet *The Future Unity of Christendom*. This pamphlet was, in the main, a strong development of Wiseman's *Letter to Lord Shrewsbury*, though it went a good deal further in a conciliatory direction than Wiseman could go, and was considerably more outspoken than he could be. The pamphlet created a sensation both on the Anglican and the Roman side. "No treatise", said Dr. Lee, "has been published for many years in England of greater interest, nor has any statement from a member of the Roman Communion received such general and respectful attention from members of the Church of England".¹ The value of the work was increased because it was known that it had been revised and approved by a well-known Roman Catholic theologian—probably Father William Lockhart. It was bitterly attacked in the *Dublin Review*, but attempts to have it placed on the Index failed ignominiously; a fact which seemed to show that official Rome was at least prepared to sympathize with the sentiments expressed even though de Lisle was exhorted to be cautious. Newman, at this time Rector of the Catholic University in Dublin, wrote on the other hand: "The subject is of all others the most interesting to an English Catholic, and you have treated it with that gentleness and affectionateness, which it not only requires, but which it gains from you on all occasions".²

This pamphlet, and the good feelings it engendered, paved the way for the foundation in September of that year of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom. In June or July 1857 a conversation took place between Dr. F. G. Lee, Bishop Forbes of Brechin and de Lisle. The following extracts from a letter of Bishop Forbes refer to this meeting:

"I have, as you may imagine, thought of little else since my conversation with yourself and Mr. Phillips. Although the

¹ *Union Review*, vol. I, p. 27.

² Purcell's *de Lisle*, I, pp. 367-368.

difficulties seem enormous, by God's help they are not insurmountable, and though the British mind is not prepared for an immediate proposition for a union, yet it is something, if in our days that mind be so far awakened to a sense of its wants, as to begin to pray for their supply. Yet I need not impress upon you how much I feel the necessity for caution. An ill-advised expression may ruin the whole good work, and therefore I do not think it would be wise to do more now than to put forth the prayer, and to furnish to the Curia all the documents we can in support of our undoubtedly valid Orders. . . . By the way, I think it would be of great use if Mr. Phillipps could see the Bishops of Oxford and Salisbury [Wilberforce and Hamilton]. The former, though intellectually and dogmatically anti-Roman has I think much sympathy with the philosophy of Catholicism so far as regards the moral necessities of the soul. The latter I think (though I have not the honour of his acquaintance) is one who would have a positive interest in our work.”¹

On September 8th a meeting was held in Lee's chambers in London at which the chair was taken by Provost Knottesford-Fortescue of St. Ninian's, Perth, while those present included de Lisle, Fr. William Lockhart, H. N. Oxenham, C. F. Lowder, John Oakley (Vicar of St. Saviour's, Hoxton, later Dean of Manchester), Henry Collins and several more. At this meeting de Lisle moved the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:—

“That a Society, to be called the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, be now formed, ‘for united prayer that visible unity may be restored to Christendom’, and that the prayer now before this meeting be sanctioned, printed and circulated, as the basis on which this society desires to act.”²

The A.P.U.C., as it came generally to be known, was at once felt to fill an obvious need, and the followers of the Oxford Movement flocked to join it, and almost all the later leaders are found among the list of its members, among them such noted anti-Papalists as Dr. R. F. Littledale, Malcolm MacColl and Sabine Baring-Gould. Prominent Roman Catholics, also, readily

¹ MS. Letter. The Bishop of Salisbury, in a Charge some four years later, speaking of the Pope, said “Non nobis cedet Episcopus Romanus, sed nos, una cum illo, cedemus Deo.”—*Charge*, 1861, p. 61.

² MS. account in a collection of documents preserved by Mr. Athelstan Riley. The prayer was that for unity from the Missal.

showed their sympathy by joining the Association, and in a list of those to whom membership forms might be sent we find the Very Rev. Thomas Sing, Canon of the R.C. Cathedral at Nottingham, Prince Emanuel Charles Gody of Bassano, the Very Rev. Dr. Hanks, Dean of Heidelberg, the Very Rev. William Knight, Canon of Hexham, and several more.¹ Dr. Lee had an interview with Cardinal Wiseman on the subject of the Association, and was able to report: “As regards the Reunion Movement, his Eminence appeared to me deeply interested in it. When, in 1857, the A.P.U.C. was started, he distinctly approved of it, and, with Father Ignatius Spencer's precedent, did not at all object to Roman Catholics belonging to it.”²

At the same time as the A.P.U.C., and closely, though not officially, connected with it, there was founded, “in the interests of Anglo-Catholicism and Union with Rome”, *The Union Newspaper*, commonly called *The Union*. This paper was soon seen to be far in advance of anything previously published by the Movement, and most of the older leaders drew back in alarm. John Keble wrote as follows:—

“Mr. Keble presents his compliments to the Editor of the *Union* and requests to be no longer considered as a subscriber to that paper . . . the amount of support promised by him to the Rev. F. G. Lee being that he would try the paper for half a year if he found it dutiful to the Church of England. He is sorry to say that he cannot consider the publication, so far as he has examined it, such as to answer this description; though he readily allows there is some very good writing in it, and he is far from questioning the motives (whatever he may think of the judgement) of its conductors.”³

The Union was in many ways an unfortunate venture; it alarmed the more conservative (Bishop Forbes, one of the Association's founders, quickly withdrew as a result of the paper's policy) and did not go far enough for the more advanced, while to Roman Catholics it appeared an anomaly. The real trouble was that it was premature. It should not have appeared until the A.P.U.C. had done at least ten years spade-work. It did, however, number among its contributors such men as Dr. Neale, Father R. M. Benson, founder of the Society of St. John the Evangelist,

¹ *Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom*, Appendix B.

² Ward, *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, vol. II, p. 489.

³ MS. letter in the writer's keeping.

Dr. R. F. Littledale and men of like calibre, while at the same time it did force men to think of union in a manner at once more practical and more concentrated than they had hitherto been accustomed to do. *The Union* was published until 1862, and in 1863 it was succeeded by the more solid and scholarly *Union Review*, though the latter, as we shall see, was to have cataclysmic results for A.P.U.C. and, indeed, for the whole reunion movement for some years to come. But the old *Union* should not be allowed to pass into a disrespectful obscurity without receiving its due of praise for being the first Anglican periodical to speak at all plainly on the question of reunion with Rome and the East.

In 1859 there was founded in France *L'Union chrétienne*, of which the Abbé Guettée was the editor. This review had a considerable circulation in unionist circles in England and acquired some influence. Guettée had already, in 1856, founded *L'Observateur catholique*, though this never had so much influence, and in both these he welcomed articles and letters from Anglicans. Unfortunately, however, Guettée was suspected for his very pronounced Gallican views and, having been condemned by bishop after bishop, the further circulation of his writings was forbidden by authority. Unhappily, too, he came somewhat under the influence of the Anglo-Continental Church Society, which was mainly controlled by the vigorously anti-Catholic Frederick Meyrick. Guettée later joined the Russian Church and became hostile to Anglicanism. He continued to edit *L'Union chrétienne* as M. Wladimir Guettée, so that what might have been a most valuable aid to making the Church of England's Catholic claims known on the Continent was lost to the cause.¹

Cardinal Wiseman, as we have seen, was inclined to be friendly towards A.P.U.C., but for some years before his death his failing health had caused him to place the charge of affairs more and more in the hands of Dr. Manning, at that time Provost of Westminster, and so began Manning's long rule of the Archdiocese and of Roman Catholics in England generally, and during that rule any reunionist might have written over the doors of Westminster, "Abandon hope all ye who enter here".

"The difference between Wiseman's treatment of the question of reunion and Manning's was not so much a difference of principle as of temperament," writes Purcell, "Wiseman's heart

¹ A brief account of Guettée will be found in Meyrick's *Memories of Life at Oxford and Elsewhere*, p. 181.

was touched, his warm imagination fired by the fact that for the first time since the Reformation a large number of clergymen of the Church of England were inspired by God's grace with an active desire for reunion with Rome. . . . Deeply as he desired such a reunion, Manning had no belief in the movement, no great trust in its advocates, no hope of its success."¹

Manning's chance arrived when the *Union Review* was sufficiently tactless as to publish certain letters from disgruntled converts, and notably from E. S. Ffoulkes, attacking, among other things, clerical celibacy. The English Roman Catholic bishops at once began to take more active cognizance of the A.P.U.C., and in April 1864 they addressed a letter to the Holy See on the subject. De Lisle, writing nearly ten years later to Lord John Manners, summed up the situation: "We had an organ in the press, it was called the *Union Review*—nothing could be better than the tone of this periodical for its first years, but unfortunately a poison was introduced—by whom? by some bad and factious Catholic priests in the North of England. These men were at open war with their bishops, were tired of the restraints of Clerical Celibacy and other Catholic ascetic observances, and in their wickedness and folly they flattered themselves that by means of Reunion they could overthrow the Discipline of the Church, as laid down by the first Council of Nicaea. Articles were written in this sense in the *Union Review*, and two clergymen of the English Church, who had joined ours, made themselves very conspicuous in advocating these innovations, attacking some Catholic Bishops even by name. I knew what would be the end of this and I wrote to warn the Editor of the *Review*, a most excellent Anglican Clergyman. He entirely agreed with me, but others were too much for us, and he allowed, against his own wish, the *Review* to continue the channel for their miserable articles. The result was, what I warned him it would be. Some of our Bishops from England complained of the thing, and represented to the authorities at the Holy See, that the working of the Association, especially thro' its official organ the *Union Review*, instead of promoting union among the separated fragments of the Christian Church was spreading disunion and disaffection in the ranks of that portion of the Baptized Body which alone remained faithful to Catholic principles and Catholic Unity."²

¹ *Life of Cardinal Manning*, vol. II, p. 277.

² Purcell's *de Lisle*, I, p. 415.

On September 16th, 1864, the Holy Office issued a decree forbidding Roman Catholics to become or to remain members of the Association. The decree contained the following sentence: "Organized and conducted by Protestants, it has resulted from a view, put forward by it in express terms, that the three Christian communions, the Roman Catholic, the schismatic Greek and the Anglican, though separated and divided one from another, yet with an equal right claim the title Catholic."¹

That sentence was a very distinct misrepresentation of the statement promulgated by the A.P.U.C., and was due to an error in translation in the Latin and French versions of the Appeal. The English version spoke only of those "three great bodies which claim for themselves the inheritance of the priesthood, and the name of Catholic", while the Latin and French versions spoke of those who had actually retained it.

"Had the English version, which was corrected and edited by de Lisle, been literally adhered to, it is possible that the congregation of the Holy Office might have taken a different view of the Association from that which was finally communicated to the associates on the 8th of November, 1865, by Cardinal Patrizi, when he declared in the name of Pius IX that the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition must take every means to prevent the faithful from joining or in anyway promoting this Association of Prayer"—so Mr. Edwin de Lisle.² Manning knew of the error, and it is mainly upon his head that the guilt of condemnation must lie. Writing to Mgr. Talbot, he asserted that the A.P.U.C. had been *in no sense misrepresented*.³ The condemnation of the A.P.U.C. was a most serious setback to the aspirations of the reunionists and, apart from Manning and Ward, one impossible to understand. The Association was entirely non-political, and existed solely for prayer. Its basis of membership stated categorically: "They are not asked to compromise any principles which they rightly or wrongly hold dear. They are asked simply to unite for the promotion of a high and holy end, in reliance on the promise of our divine Lord, that 'whatever we shall ask in prayer, believing, we shall receive; . . . the daily use of a short form of prayer, together with one 'Our Father'—for the intention of the Association—is the only obligation incurred by

¹ The official documents are given in translation in *Messenger, Rome and Reunion*, pp. 91–105.

² Purcell's *de Lisle*, vol. I, p. 373.

³ Purcell's *Manning*, II, p. 281.

those who join it; to which is added, in the case of priests, the offering, at least once in three months, of the Holy Sacrifice for the same intention." The *Union Review* had no more than an accidental connection with the Association, whose members were certainly in no way pledged to its *dicta*, a fact they soon pointed out.

Ambrose de Lisle did all in his power to avert the catastrophe and, had Wiseman still been in full power, would probably have succeeded. After the condemnation he earnestly entreated to be allowed to continue a member, only resigning when told that he would be considered disloyal if he did not do so.

It was immediately decided to forward a reply to the Holy Office.¹ The reply was largely the work of de Lisle, and was forwarded to Rome in the summer of 1865 signed by 198 Anglican clergy. In this reply several of the mis-statements in the Letter of the Holy Office were corrected, and on the question of the right to be called Catholics they said:

"On that question our prospectus gave no opinion whatever. What we said treated of the question of *fact*, not of *right*. We affirmed merely that the Anglican Church claimed for itself the name Catholic; which is abundantly plain to all, both from the Liturgy and the Articles of Religion."² The aim of the Association they stated thus: "What we beseech Almighty God to grant, what we desire with all our hearts, is nothing else than that ecumenical intercommunion which existed before the schism of East and West, founded and built up on the profession of one and the same Catholic Faith."³

Mgr. Talbot, who was at that time the power behind the Papal Throne, consulted Manning as to the form that the reply to this letter should take and, presumably, its unfavourable nature must again be laid at Manning's door. The reply was signed by Cardinal Patrizi, and appears altogether to have ignored the explanations given. For example, we still read in it: ". . . forasmuch as you imagine that those Christian com-

¹ The writer preserves the original draft of this Reply, in the handwriting of Father William Lockhart.

² De qua questione nullam prorsus programma nostrum tulit sententiam. Quod diximus quaestionem *facti* non *juris* tractavit. Affirmavimus solummodo, Ecclesiam Anglicanam nomen sibi Catholicum vindicare; quod omnibus, tam a Liturgia quam ab Articulis Religionis, abunde patet."

³ "Id quod Deo O.M. enixe rogamus, quod toto corde desideramus, non aliud est, quam illa, quae ante Orientis et Occidentis scissionem, intercommunio Oecumenica extitit, unius ejusdemque Fidei Catholicae professione stabilita atque compacta."

munities which boast that they have inherited the priesthood and the name Catholic, constitute true portions of the Church of Jesus Christ, though divided and separated from the Apostolic See of Peter". Whatever the signatories of the letter may have thought, that was certainly not what they had said.

The day after this reply arrived in England Father Lockhart wrote to Lee: "I have had a great deal of conversation with our friend Mr. de Lisle on the subject of the Cardinal Prefect's letter. I find him in very low spirits about the prospects of the A.P.U.C. I have done my best to encourage him. I do not by any means share his forebodings and feel more confidence than I ever had in the good cause.

" 1st. Because all opposition is so far a sign of the work being of God, and no good work proceeds without it.

" 2nd. The opposition through the instrumentality of good men is a special form of opposition which is always to be observed when a great work of importance is in question.

" 3rd. Opposition grounded on a false representation of facts shows that the devil has a hand in it, and that good men with right intentions are led to form a right judgement on wrong premises.

" 4th. It was always against us that we could be called insignificant; this can no longer be said since the Roman Congregation has taken up the matter.

" 5th. The importance of A.P.U.C. as an organization was very little known since very few names of any weight had been published; now I hear you are endeavouring to bring forward an array of names that will carry weight. If this can be done I feel the greatest confidence that a step will thus have been taken which will at once place the Association on a new footing and show it to be an important and representative movement and as such it will certainly meet with the greatest sympathy and consideration from our highest authorities and we should not only get our explanation accepted as expressing the views of the Association and the Letter of the Cardinal Prefect withdrawn or modified, but the whole theory would be as well understood and appreciated as it is now misunderstood and undervalued. I do therefore most earnestly hope that many leading members of the Association may be induced by you to sign the explanatory letter which you have in hand and also an address to our Cardinal Legate in England, asking him to give his approval to the Associa-

tion as far as he may agree with its object and to assist the members in laying the facts of the case before Rome.

" It may perhaps be said by some that to negotiate with our authorities should be the work of the R. Catholic members of the Association but the answer is obvious that, if the Association is of importance, it is as it represents the Anglican feeling towards the Holy See, and the action of R. Catholics is paralysed unless Anglicans come forward decidedly to take the initiative, in fact without this any action on our part would do more harm than good. No doubt it was good in the infancy of the society not to publish names, and this for many reasons, but now that you have 2000 members, there must be numbers whose names would carry weight, and of these no doubt a proportion would allow their names to be made public. To do this is that downright English mode of action which is always popular and generally successful, and to do this at the present juncture seems to me a special mode of meeting the case, which must change discomfiture into success.

" I think it is a great point that the Association has not been disapproved on the ground of supposed 'communicatio in sacris', which I have heard generally taken up by its opponents as the *prima facie* objection, also I am still more glad that there is nothing said as to Corporate Reunion in itself."¹

Father Lockhart's predictions did not, however, come true, and although the A.P.U.C. continued to function until 1921, its period of most effective usefulness had passed with the condemnation engineered by the English Ultramontane Roman Catholics, and Anglican reunionists began more and more to look to the Continent for sympathy, rather than to the members of the Roman Church in England.

¹ MS. letter.

IV

DR. PUSEY AND THE "EIRENICON"

IN November, 1864, Manning, in reply to a remark of Dr. Pusey in which he had said that while some Roman Catholics regarded the Church of England as the great bulwark against infidelity in this land, others rejoiced at what injured her,¹ issued an Open Letter to Pusey entitled *The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England*. In this pamphlet Manning set out to show why, though he rejoiced in any workings of the Holy Ghost in the Church of England, far from regarding the Church of England as a "bulwark against infidelity", he regarded her as responsible for religious anarchy. "I am afraid, then, that the Church of England, so far from a barrier against infidelity, must be recognized as the mother of all the intellectual and spiritual aberrations which now cover the face of England."² Pusey's reaction may best be told in the words of his biographer:

"Pusey reluctantly thought it necessary to reply. He commenced his answer in the form of a Letter to Keble, defending the English Church against Manning's account of it; but while he was wearily arguing over the old ground to show that the Thirty-nine Articles diverged in language rather than in meaning from the decrees of the Council of Trent, he suddenly changed his plan. He determined to drop entirely the tone of apology, and to make his answer a plea for reunion between the Church of England and the Church of Rome."³ Pusey himself, at a meeting of the English Church Union, gave further details of the birth of the *Eirenicon*: "When I began the letter, nothing was further from my purpose than writing an *Eirenicon*. It was put to me—'You must answer this letter of Manning's.' I undertook it, because it was put upon me by those whom I could not refuse; and when I had got through a great deal of it, and made our defence, it came to me—certainly not of myself—thus, 'Is this all? Is it to end in this continual defence and separation?' And then I wrote the rest. I went abroad two or three times, in order to ascertain whether that which I

¹ Pusey, *Legal Force of the Judgment of the Privy Council*, pp. 3-4.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 30.

³ Liddon, *Life of E. B. Pusey*, D.D., vol. IV, pp. 97-98.

hoped, was a dream or not. Of course I cannot repeat anything which any individual spoke to me; but I saw Bishops, and I saw some whom the papers do not know that I saw; so that it cannot be said that anything I say is the opinion of any particular Bishop whom the papers did say that I saw."⁴

So was born the first *Eirenicon*, addressed to John Keble.⁵ The book was partly a vindication of the Catholic character of the Church of England, but a large part was given up to a vigorous denunciation of certain Ultramontane devotions to our Lady which, while not being *de fide*, might be regarded as in some measure authoritative.⁶ "I doubt not", he said, "that the Roman Church and ourselves are kept apart much more by that vast practical system which lies beyond the letter of the Council of Trent, things which are taught with a quasi-authority in the Roman Church, than by what is actually defined. . . . The Council of Trent laid down, in many cases, what is very far below the practical system, encouraged, at present, everywhere in the Church of Rome, taught in her name and with her authority, but which, on being questioned, no Roman Catholic, I believe, would declare to be *de fide*."⁷ He proceeded to deal in the same way with the doctrines of Purgatory and Indulgences, and put forth a plea that the extreme views on these points should be authoritatively declared not to be *de fide*, and so not necessarily to be taken into account in discussions on reunion. In an explanatory letter to *The Weekly Register* Pusey went a little further: "I am thankful that you have brought out the main drift and object of my *Eirenicon*, what, in my mind, underlies the whole, to show that, in my conviction, there is no insurmountable obstacle to the union of the Roman, Greek and Anglican communions. I have long been convinced that there is nothing in the Council of Trent which could not be explained satisfactorily to us, if it were explained authoritatively . . . nothing in our Articles which cannot be explained rightly, as not contradicting anything held to be *de fide* in the Roman Church. The great body of the faith is held alike by both."⁸

¹ *English Church Union Monthly Circular*, vol. II (1866), p. 197.

² *The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity: An Eirenicon*, in a Letter to the Author of *The Christian Year*. Oxford (Parker), 1865.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 101-189, 1st ed.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 98-99.

⁵ Quoted, Oxenham, *Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon considered in Relation to Catholic Unity: A Letter to the Rev. Father Lockhart*, 2nd ed., pp. 20-21.

Pusey, however, was quite clear that the Council of Trent did need explaining, and he recognized that there were explanations of it which he could not accept. In his speech to the English Church Union, when he was replying to a virulent attack upon him by Mr. Archer Gurney, he said, ". . . as Mr. Gurney has stated what is the meaning of the *Eirenicon* I would beg to say that he has omitted one exceedingly important word, and that word is, 'explained'. What I have said there, and what I have said to the Gallican Bishops, and what they have clearly understood, is this 'that I believe the Council of Trent whatever its look may be, and our Articles, whatever their look may be, each could be so explained as to be reconcilable one with the other'. Now, of course, there is a mode of explaining the Council of Trent which I myself cannot receive. . . ." ¹

The importance of the *Eirenicon*, with the subsequent explanations of it by Dr. Pusey in *The Weekly Register* and elsewhere, cannot be over-estimated in dealing with the history of this period. Not only was Dr. Pusey the acknowledged leader of the Oxford Movement, he was far more. Newman, in answering the *Eirenicon*, said to him: "However, you are more than an individual; from early youth you have devoted yourself to the Established Church, and, after between forty and fifty years of unremitting labour in its service, your roots and your branches stretch out through every portion of its large territory. . . . You cannot speak merely for yourself; your antecedents, your existing influence, are a pledge to us, that what you may determine will be the determination of a multitude. . . . There is no one anywhere—among ourselves, in your own body, or, I suppose, in the Greek Church—who can affect so large a circle of men, so virtuous, so able, so learned, so zealous, as come, more or less, under your influence." ²

In addition to this, the advance marked by the work was such as might scarcely be believed. Frederick Oakeley, who regarded it in no very friendly light, bore his testimony on this point: ". . . we must all be amply gratified by the fact of one holding so high a position, and possessing so extensive a command over the hearts and consciences of others, feeling himself able, in the face of the world, to declare that he is prepared to accept all our *de fide* doctrines in the true sense of the Church; and that union

¹ *English Church Union Monthly Circular*, vol. II, p. 197.

² *A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey on his Recent Eirenicon*, 3rd ed., pp. 4-5.

with us is the dearest object of his pursuit. This is surely a great step. It seems like a dream, that a claim bearing so great a similarity to that for the avowal of which, only twenty years ago, Mr. Ward was stripped of his M.A. gown by a vote of the Oxford Convocation, and myself suspended from all ministerial functions in the province of Canterbury, by a sentence of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Court, except on condition of a full and free recantation of my 'errors', should now be advanced by a Canon of Christ Church and a Regius Professor without reserve, yet without reproach."¹

The first reaction to the book was everywhere favourable. Pusey wrote that he did not hear of any expression of disapprobation, even among those who disagreed with it.² W. G. Ward, however, wrote to Pusey announcing his intention of attacking the book, which he did in no uncertain manner, and Newman himself wrote in a way that greatly damped Pusey's hopes. He seized upon the point that most troubled Roman Catholics—namely, the many instances given by Pusey of what he considered extreme statements with regard to our Lady, Purgatory and Indulgences. "It is true, too true, that your book disappointed me," wrote Newman. "It does seem to me that 'Irenicon' is a misnomer; and that it is calculated to make most Catholics very angry—and that because they will consider it rhetorical and unfair." Pusey, in a reply to Newman, stated his difficulty: "I am, as you see, in this dilemma: if I do not state difficulties, I seem unreal; if I do state them, I seem controversial." Newman had clearly misunderstood Pusey's purpose in giving the catena of "condemned" quotations. The intention, as Pusey stated it, was "I thought 'There it is; if any of it is disowned, it is a gain'"³.

But if Newman so misunderstood the purpose of the book, it was even more likely that others should do so, and so indeed they did. The French bishops and clergy, with whom Pusey put himself into immediate personal contact, were on the whole favourable to the work. *Études Religieuses*, a paper published by the Jesuits in Paris, stated: "It is certain, whatever happens, that in order to unite the Established Church to the Catholic

¹ *The Leading Topics in Dr. Pusey's Recent Work*, Reviewed in a Letter to the Most Rev. H. E. Manning, pp. 4-5. But it was probably less for claiming to hold Roman doctrine than for assenting to the Articles in a "non-natural sense" that Ward was stripped of his degrees.

² *Life of . . . Pusey*, vol. IV, p. 118.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 119-124.

Church, Dr. Pusey has made considerable advances, such that no Protestant peacemaker has ever made before. . . . M. Pusey goes forward in his *démarche* with a full realization of his aim. Probably no Protestant has studied Catholic doctrine better than he, while on the other hand the chief doctors of the Anglican Church are equally well known to him.”¹

Jules Gondon, on the other hand, who was warmly sympathetic towards the Tractarians, wholly failed to grasp the intention of the *Eirenicon* when he wrote: “. . . the work announces peace to us and it brings together a whole arsenal of arguments directed against the Church to which the author proffers his hand”.² Great European scholars such as Dr. von Döllinger, however, were loud in their praise of the work. English Roman Catholics, on the other hand, were at best lukewarm, while Manning and Ward, not unnaturally as the leading Ultramontanes in England, were bitterly hostile. Of all the pamphlets which poured from the press dealing with the *Eirenicon*, only one on the Roman Catholic side really understood its import, and that was H. N. Oxenham’s Letter to Father Lockhart: “And let me add”, wrote Oxenham, “that never was there a time when the Church of England had so strong a claim as now on the sympathy and co-operation of Catholics for regaining her rightful position within the sphere of Catholic Unity.”³

On the Anglican side opinion was divided. There were those who desired that the same treatment should be meted out to Dr. Pusey as to W. G. Ward twenty years before; while others, and these neither inconsiderable in number or position, expressed warm gratitude for the lead he had given them. Two English bishops expressed warm approval. Bishop Hamilton of Salisbury, as might be expected, wrote: “Having read it, I can thank you for it as God’s good gift to our Church in our present distress. Both Churches, viz. the Roman and English, are in practice far below their fixed standards; but what everyone must, I think, feel after reading your book is that we are by God’s mercy emerging from the low atmosphere of our past practical system, and that Rome seems to be more and more substituting the evils of her practical system for the higher teaching of her Canons.”⁴

Dr. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, wrote less

¹ January, 1866, art. “Le docteur Pusey et son nouveau programme d’union avec l’Eglise catholique”. ² *De la Réunion . . .*, p. 239.

³ *Letter to the Rev. Father Lockhart*, p. 91. ⁴ *Life of . . . Pusey*, vol. IV, p. 117.

expectedly: “I must be honest—so I won’t say that former fears as to the possibility of union are yet wholly removed. But this I can honestly say, that your book has completely prevented me ever throwing obstacle or opposition in the way of union between Churches. At present, then, thanks to your Christian learning, I stand ‘at gaze’—fears still, but *some* nascent hopes in my heart.”¹

The most penetrating criticism of the work on the Anglican side came from the pen of Dean Church, and appeared in *The Times* of December 12th, 1865: “That Christians who can look out beyond their own particular body should wish to see Christendom reunited seems the natural consequence of the command of Christ and of the immemorial understanding of the Church that His disciples should be one. And what is thus to be desired is a reasonable subject of thought and inquiry.” He goes on, however, to criticize stringently Dr. Pusey’s estimate of the problem: “The reunion of Christendom is a vague word, and would have very different meanings, according to the differences of theological systems. With Dr. Pusey it appears to mean, not a fusion into one, but a pacification of the various organized communions of Christendom, which now more or less distinctly are in a hostile attitude to one another. . . . He wants such a peace between Churches as there is among States; such a good understanding and forbearance in the religious organization of Christendom as there is in the political.”²

To Pusey, and to many who thought with him, the most disappointing reply to the *Eirenicon* was that of Newman. In spite of explanations hurriedly given by private letter, and in spite of Pusey’s own letters to *The Weekly Register*, Newman seemed still to misunderstand the purport of the passages relating to abuse of *de fide* doctrines: “We give you a sharp cut, and you return it. You complain of our being ‘dry, hard and unsympathizing’; and we answer that you are unfair and irritating. But we at least have not professed to be composing an *Irenicon*, when we treated you as foes. There was one of old time who wreathed his sword in myrtle; excuse me—you discharge your olive-branch as if from a catapult.”³

¹ *Life of . . . Pusey*, vol. IV, p. 118. Yet in July, 1885, at the opening of a new aisle at Christ Church, Clifton, Dr. Ellicott attacked with bitter ferocity the ideal of reunion with Rome. ² *Occasional Papers*, vol. I, pp. 341-342.

³ *A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey on his Recent Eirenicon*, p. 9.

Newman spent nearly a hundred pages dealing with Pusey's structures on "illicit cultus". His conclusion was to condemn vigorously the teaching contained in the passages: "They deny all *loci theologici*. There is nothing of them in the Missal, in the Roman Catechism, in the Roman *Raccolta*, in the *Imitation of Christ*, in Gother, Challoner, Milner or Wiseman as far as I am aware. They do but scare and confuse me. . . . I will have nothing to do with statements that can only be explained away. I do not, however, speak of these statements, as they are found in their authors, for I know nothing of the originals, and cannot believe that they have meant what you say; but I take them as they lie in your pages. . . . And now, having said as much as this, bear with me, my dear Friend, if I end with an expostulation. Have you not been touching us on a very tender point in a very rude way? Is not the effect of what you have said to expose her to scorn who is dearer to us than any other creature. . . . Take a parallel case, and consider how you would decide it yourself. Supposing an opponent of a doctrine for which you so earnestly contend, the eternity of punishment, instead of meeting you with direct arguments against it, heaped together a number of extravagant descriptions of the place, mode and circumstances of its infliction, quoted Tertullian as a witness for the primitive Fathers, and the Covenanters and Ranters for these last centuries; brought passages from the *Inferno* of Dante, and from the sermons of Wesley and Whitefield . . . would you think this a fair and becoming method of reasoning? and, if he avowed that he should ever consider the Anglican Church committed to all these accessories of the doctrine, till its authorities formally denounced Taylor, and Whitefield, and a hundred others, would you think this an equitable determination, or the procedure of a theologian?"¹

Newman himself was bitterly attacked by the Ultramontanes, and Monsignor Talbot wrote to Manning that, "The spirit of Newman's Letter is most offensive".² It was, indeed, hardly to be expected that the Ultramontanes would welcome from Newman that repudiation of their own popular excesses for which Pusey had asked. On the other hand, as Pusey's biographer remarks concerning Newman's Letter: "rarely has rhetorical skill been more ingeniously employed than in this half-playful banter. The expression about the 'catapult' lives

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 120-122.

² Purcell's *Manning*, vol. II, p. 308 n.

in memory more easily than the rest of the controversy; but its injustice is generally overlooked. Pusey had certainly laid bare without reserve the serious defects of popular Romanism; for, as has already been said, it would have been useless to approach the question of Reunion without frankly stating the great obstacles which some Roman teaching had put in its way. But Newman's epigram cleverly diverted attention from the fact that the sting lay in the obstacles themselves and not in their enumeration."¹

Pusey was also at this time physically active. In October, 1865, he had spent ten days in Paris urging upon the Archbishop and other French ecclesiastics the principles of the *Eirenicon*. He paid another visit to France in the December of that year, when, among others, he met Dupanloup. "One eminent theologian saluted him as a true brother; an archbishop introduced him to a somewhat startled subordinate as a fellow-Catholic."²

During 1866, while he was helping in the cholera epidemic in Bethnal Green, and in 1867, Pusey worked at his reply to Newman. In 1866, while he was engaged in this task, appeared the first volume of *Peace through the Truth: or Essays on Subjects connected with Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon*, by Father Thomas Harper, S.J. The greater part of this volume was filled with calumny and ill-considered invective, and at no point did its author pretend to make so much as an attempt to understand Dr. Pusey's intentions. The book obviously wounded Pusey, though he did not take it very seriously. A writer in the *Union Review*—probably E. S. Ffoulkes—said of it: "Other Roman Catholic writers, better known to the public than Father Harper, had shown a disposition to meet Dr. Pusey half way, and had treated him as a friendly envoy to be negotiated with on terms of mutual courtesy and respect—not an enemy to be mocked at or repulsed. But there is not one syllable from beginning to end of this bulky volume, which twice repeats on its title page the promise of 'peace', that does not convey or imply a declaration of war to the knife. . . . It is a direct attempt to replace all the stumbling-blocks which Dr. Pusey, with singular courage and charity had laboured to remove, to harden and sharpen afresh all the bitter antagonisms which time and friendlier intercourse were gradually

¹ *Life of . . . Pusey*, vol. IV, p. 136.

² Prestige, *Edward Bouverie Pusey*, p. 135.

dissolving, and to denounce reconciliation as sinful in any sense in which it is not impossible."¹

Newman took a more serious view of this book than did Pusey himself. However, the very valuable Appendix to Pusey's Second *Eirenicon*, with its analysis of Cardinal de Turrecremata's work on the Immaculate Conception, was meant as a reply to Fr. Harper.

The Second *Eirenicon*—*First Letter to the Very Rev. J. H. Newman, D.D., In Explanation chiefly in Regard to the Reverential Love due to the Ever-Blessed Theotokos*—was finally published in 1869, having been spurred to its finish by the Pope's summons to the Vatican Council in June, 1868.

The reception of this second attempt at peace was no more favourable on the Ultramontane side. "It seemed to Pusey almost hopeless to think of Reunion with the Roman Catholic Church when the vast majority of their number were not inclined to believe his single-hearted desire for peace. Yet he still intended to publish a third, and he hoped a more successful, *Eirenicon*, in the form of a second Letter to Newman."²

Here, again, it should be realized that it was only the school of Manning and W. G. Ward that was responsible for this attitude on the part of Roman Catholics. Those like Dupanloup received the work in the spirit in which it was intended and, indeed, were most anxious that Anglicans should attend the Vatican Council. Father Victor de Buck, a Belgian Jesuit, had actually written to Bishop Forbes of Brechin begging him to attend and suggesting that Dr. Pusey should accompany him as his theologian. Dr. Pusey, though he trusted Dupanloup, did not trust de Buck, and wrote to Bishop Forbes persuading him to write to the Jesuit setting forth the considerable difficulties involved. Pusey saw, what probably Dupanloup and de Buck did not see, the opportunity that an acceptance would give to Manning and *The Dublin Review*.

While these various negotiations and correspondences were proceeding, Pusey was writing his third *Eirenicon*. This work—*Is Healthful Reunion Impossible? A Second Letter to the Very Rev. J. H. Newman, D.D.*—appeared early in 1870. Perhaps the most interesting part of it to-day is that in which Pusey speaks of himself and his own efforts for reunion: "For the *Eirenicon*

¹ Vol. V, p. 72.

² *Life of . . . Pusey*, vol. IV, p. 165.

itself, I could not even conjecture what its effects would be. I could only commit it to God, Who, I hoped, had taught me to turn into an *Eirenicon* what, at the earnest desire of others, I had begun as a defence. . . .

"While my name is forgotten here, and the newest, most unpopular name of reproach for us all (ritualists or non-ritualists) is 'Ritualist', those who abroad look at the work of God here with interest and love, ascribe to me an influence which I never sought, never had, and least of all have now. And this it seems honest to say now. For I wish, in this new *Eirenicon* to be understood as speaking in the name of no one but my single self. I have consulted no one. The one whom I ever consulted, with whom I was ever one, who was deeply interested in whatever might promote healthful reunion, to whom, in his last days, the hope was a subject of joy [Keble] can now only pray for it, but, perhaps, does more for us there. I write, then, in the name of no party. But I do write in the full confidence that I express the feeling of thousands upon thousands of English hearts, both here and in the United States, when I say, that if, not individual, but accredited, Roman authority could say, 'Reunion would involve your professing your belief in this, and that and that, but it would not involve your receiving such and such opinions, practices or devotions, or matters of discipline,' I believe the middle wall of partition which has existed so long in, as we believe, the one fold of Christendom would be effectually shattered."¹

Both Pusey and Newman, as their correspondence shows, were dreading the definition of Papal Infallibility by the Vatican Council, Pusey because he believed it false, and Newman because he believed it inopportune and because he feared the triumph of the extremists.² On July 18th, 1870, however, the definition was adopted. "In all later issues of his third *Eirenicon*, Pusey altered the title from *Is Healthful Reunion possible?* to a form which embodied his future attitude towards the Roman Question—*Healthful Reunion, as conceived possible before the Vatican Council*."³ Writing to Newman later in the same year he said, surely with

¹ *Third Eirenicon*, pp. 340-343.

² For Newman's attitude at this time see Ward, *Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, vol. II, pp. 200-241 and 279-312. Butler, *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne*, vol. II, pp. 58-59, has an important letter from Newman on the subject.

³ *Life of . . . Pusey*, vol. IV, p. 193.

a sense of tragedy: "However, I say this, because I am writing to you; I have done what I could, and now have done with controversy and Eirenica."¹

Many years later, when Dr. F. G. Lee had coupled his name with those of Newman and Manning in the dedication of his little book *Order out of Chaos*, he wrote: "To me, however, corporate reunion has faded away, since they have made the personal infallibility of the Pope, independent of the Church, an article of faith. They cannot even admit Dr. Döllinger into Communion, whose eminent services to the Church, before their new article of faith, they acknowledged. If your book should have a second edition, will you leave out my name?"²

¹ *Ibid.*

² MS. letter.

V

THE PRELUDE TO THE VATICAN COUNCIL

DURING the years that Pusey was producing the three parts of his *Eirenicon*, others were taking an increasingly active part in the reunion movement. Notable among these was the distinguished Anglican layman, Mr. Gerard F. Cobb, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. The rumour of a coming Council at Rome had spread abroad some time before the Bull of June 29th, 1868, convening it, had been promulgated, and Cobb, a man of truly eirenic mind, published in 1867 a small book designed to deal with one aspect of the reunion question in preparation for the coming Council. This book was *The Kiss of Peace; or England and Rome at One on the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*. The book was an examination of the eucharistic doctrine of the Council of Trent and of the Anglican formularies and divines. What Newman in 1841 had done in respect of the Thirty-nine Articles, what Pusey was now doing on a broad canvas, Cobb was here seeking to do for the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. His purpose he briefly stated as follows: "It is a common belief among a large majority of the members of the Church of England, that she does not hold the doctrine of the 'Real Objective Presence'. And this belief is unfortunately strengthened by the materialistic tendencies of the present day, which regard nothing as 'real' which cannot be apprehended by *sense*, or as 'objective' which does not perceptibly conform to those laws of Extension and Visibility which we *see* or *feel* to be in operation around us.

"Another equally or perhaps more widely prevalent belief is that the Church of England, when she *rejects* the doctrine of 'Transsubstantiation', uses the word in the *same* sense as the Church of Rome uses it when she *accepts* it.

"In neither of these two prevalent beliefs can the writer concur; and it is in the hope that others also may be brought to deem them erroneous, that he ventures to bring the following pages under their notice."¹

The book was followed shortly afterwards by *The Sequel to the Kiss of Peace*, in which Cobb set out his views more fully, answered

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 2.

certain objections and dealt at some length with "The Principle of Authority and the Right of Private Judgment", concluding the whole with an eloquent appeal for a change of heart towards the problem of Catholic reunion.¹ In spite, however, of its spirit of charity and the very considerable amount of learning displayed in it, the book was very largely unnoticed, and Cobb returned to the attack in 1869 with *A Few Words on Reunion and the Coming Council at Rome*. In this pamphlet he attacked the "prevalent attitude of apathy and coldness" towards the Council which he found among members of the Church of England. "In a few months nearly one thousand Christian bishops, most of them men of great natural ability as well as large experience in their episcopal calling, assisted by Assessors who have spent their lives in the study of Holy Scripture and the theological heirloom of the Church, will meet together under the presidency of one who (whatever views may be taken of his office), more than any living man commands the reverence and admiration of Christian hearts. The objects, moreover, of its discussion will be such as concern not merely every member of Christ's Church, but every member of the human race. . . . It is surely, then, not a very encouraging token of the times that this great Council should have been summoned for these purposes, and yet the prospect of its session should seem to excite so little interest and elicit so little sympathy among those who profess to pray daily for the advancement of the Faith, and for the Unity of the Church of Christ."²

Cobb was one of those who were anxious that Anglicans should attend the Council with a view to discussing differences. "To decline to discuss differences, until there are no differences left to discuss is, to use an apt though homely illustration, very like refusing to go into the water until you can swim."³

¹ Very similar conclusions to those of Cobb are reached by H. E. Symonds, C.R., in *The Council of Trent and the Anglican Formularies*, and by A. H. Rees in *Eucharistic Doctrine and Reunion*.

² *A Few words . . .*, pp. 1-2.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 16. After the Vatican Council's definition of Papal Infallibility Cobb lost faith. "Mr. Cobb had based all his hopes on the Council", wrote Lord Halifax to the Abbé Portal, "he believed that the Council would indeed reconcile all, and that it would never erect the infallibility of the Pope into an article of Faith; when the dogma was proclaimed Cobb lost faith, ceased to communicate and has long remained isolated, with all the foundations of his belief broken." *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, p. 59. Cobb's works were among those recommended by Halifax to Portal when the question of Anglican ordinations was under discussion. Portal wrote, ". . . I cannot tell you how interested I have been by the extracts of a work of Cobb, *A Few Words, etc.*"—*Ibid.*, p. 56.

We have already spoken of Bishop Forbes' interest in the Council. In 1866 Pusey, who was at that time resolved to re-issue Newman's *Tract XC*, urged Forbes to write a treatise of greater length on the Catholic interpretation of the Articles. After some hesitation the Bishop agreed and the book was published the following year under the title *An Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles*. It was prefaced by a long Epistle Dedicatory to Dr. Pusey which concluded thus: "In all that I have written I have had in view the future reunion of the Church. Recognizing the providential position of the Anglican Church, as stretching forth one hand to the Protestant bodies, and the other to the Latin and Greek Churches, I have tried to do justice to that position, by acknowledging on the one hand the great necessity for a reform in morals and discipline at the time of separation, and on the other by minimizing the points of difference between ourselves and those venerable institutions. It is no longer a question of opinions on either side. The basis of reunion must be on that which is ruled *de fide*, and of this nothing is to be assumed as such, but the contrary of what is published under anathema. This reduces the difficulty, and leaves a wide margin for negotiation and explanation. May God in His good time incline men's hearts to this, and let the heavens rejoice and the earth be glad, for that the wall of partition is broken down."¹

Bishop Forbes wrote to Gladstone at this time: "One has sat down under many of the difficulties of Anglicanism, in hopes of better times, and in appeal to a future Ecumenical Council. For the first time since that of Trent, a Synod of the Latin Church, from whence we sprung or revolted, is to be held next year. The Anglican position will be either much bettered or deteriorated by its action. If it merely registers the foregone conclusions of the Gesù, our way is clearer; if it takes up questions in a moderate and Christian spirit, we have no standing-ground for the future but acceptance, or simply Protestant rebellion. How much may be done beforehand!"²

Eminent Roman Catholics were already regarding Bishop Forbes with friendly eyes. We find, for example, Cardinal Pitra writing to George Hay Forbes in 1865: "Even in the Eucharistic controversy that has made such a stir in Scotland and of which you

¹ 6th ed., pp. xxxix-xl.

² Perry, *Alexander Penrose Forbes*, pp. 132-133.

speak (though you yourself exhibit more than one point of difference between us), I find many reasons for applauding the courage of your brother, the Bishop of Brechin."¹

As early, indeed, as 1863, the Bishop had spoken to his annual diocesan synod concerning the possible value of a general council: "No, my brethren, the deepest thinkers of the day are stretching forth to a unity comprehending all these scattered members. They feel that if the sixteenth century was one of dispersion, the nineteenth and twentieth must be one of re-union, if the Son of Man, when He cometh, is to 'find *the* faith (as the original Greek is most correctly rendered) on the earth.' While, on the one hand, opinions hitherto held in solution are being precipitated, and men are being called, as they never have been called before, to choose between a Christianity organized, hierarchical, and dogmatic, and a scepticism implying sinful uncertainty of mind; on the other hand, as the means of locomotion are developed, and true Christian civilization advances, prejudices are being insensibly worn down, religious bitterness is giving way, and men are coming to see that truth without love is an impossibility in the order of grace. And, as in the century preceding the Reformation, earnest men of all hues of opinion looked forward to the assembling of a General Council as the great cure of the evils of the day, so now may not we, laying to heart the great dangers we are in from our unhappy divisions, hope, and labour and pray for the hour when the Church of God shall again come together in its glory and strength, when, compelled by the crushing assaults of the common foe, and animated by the earnest desire of peace, all who believe in the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour, and in the necessity of a visible Church as His organ, shall assemble under the guidance of God Himself. . . ."²

The Council which did assemble, however, was one in which neither the Church of England nor the Church of the East had any part, and its definition of Papal Infallibility was a blow to the Bishop. He had, as his biographer remarks, been prepared to go far in the direction of conciliation, but he was, both by temperament and conviction, drawn more to the Gallican than to the Ultramontane party, and, though Dr. von Döllinger, with whom he was in constant touch, must have prepared him in some

¹ Perry, *George Hay Forbes*, p. 157.

² *The Notes of Unity and Sanctity in Reference to Modern Scepticism: A Charge*, pp. 19-20.

measure, yet to the end he underestimated the strength of the Ultramontanes. In his Charge before the diocesan synod of 1871 he dealt with the subject of the Vatican Decrees and gave his reasons for not accepting them. Dr. Perry describes this Charge as one of the best things the Bishop ever wrote.¹ For the last five years of his life Bishop Forbes retired from the ecumenical field.

Throughout these years, too, the work of seeking means of *rapprochement* with the Eastern Churches was gathering in momentum. The Tractarians and their successors had ever entertained lively hopes of reunion with the Orthodox, and no one had done more to bring the problem before Anglicans than the learned Warden of Sackville College, John Mason Neale. As early as 1847 Dr. Neale had published the first part of his *History of the Holy Eastern Church*,² and throughout the succeeding years he had been busy translating the hymns and liturgies of the East. In this work Neale was a pioneer, and in the Preface to his *Hymns of the Eastern Church* he said: "I trust the reader will not forget the immense difficulty of an attempt so perfectly new as the present, where I have had no predecessors, and therefore could have no master."³

In 1863, largely through Neale's influence, the Eastern Church Association (E.C.A.) had been founded. The Chairman at the inaugural meeting was that strange figure who flits across the stage of the Revival during these years, George Nugee, whose monastery in the Old Kent Road excited the scorn of Tyrell and the admiration of Walter Pater. The Association had three main objectives: the education of Anglican Churchmen on the subject of the Orthodox Churches; the promotion of friendly intercourse between Anglicans and Orthodox and the pecuniary assistance, where possible, of Orthodox bishops. Among those who were members of its original committee were T. T. Carter of Clewer, H. P. Liddon, J. M. Neale, Dr. John Wordsworth, later Bishop of Salisbury, and the Hon. C. L. Wood, later Lord Halifax.⁴

That there was need for such an association is clearly evidenced by the kind of work which the E.C.A. was early called upon to

¹ *Alexander Penrose Forbes*, p. 149.

² *I.e.*, the two volumes on "The Patriarchate of Alexandria," the general Introduction to the work was not published until 1850.

³ 5th ed., p. 17.

⁴ For an account of the opening meeting see *Union Review*, vol. II, p. 319.

undertake. For a number of years the Church Missionary Society and the British and Foreign Bible Society had been conducting proselytizing missions in all parts of the East. Dr. Pusey, as we have seen, had protested against this policy as early as 1842, but the policy still continued. By far the greater share of this proselytizing, it is true, had been initiated in America and a certain amount of it from within the Protestant Episcopal Church itself. But the Church of England was not blameless and Anglicans had continued to protest against such a policy. A notable protest had come from George Percy Badger, who was on an official mission to the Near East, and particularly to the Nestorians of Kurdistan, from 1842-44. He wrote a valuable book, *The Nestorians and their Rituals*, at the beginning of which he gives an account of his dealings with the American missionaries.¹ It was against this attitude, too, that much Tractarian opposition to the Jerusalem Bishopric had been directed. Proselytizing had been clearly envisaged in the Scheme and its *Grundsätze* contained the following sentences: "At the same time, it is not to be disguised, that the divergences at present subsisting between certain national Churches are very great, nay, in some instances so considerable, that it is by faith alone that they are enabled to recognize themselves as 'one' in the bond of Christian communion, and as standing within the pale of common concert. For instance, it is difficult to conceive that a Protestant Church holding the true faith, could show a spirit of indifference with regard to the superstitious practices which prevail at this time among the major part of the Eastern Churches, in the matter of image and picture worship."²

It is primarily to the E.C.A., however, that the honour is due for recognising that we should not seek converts from the Eastern Churches, but should rather seek reunion with them. In 1868 the Association addressed an interesting Memorial to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, in which they asserted that the American Church was better qualified than the English for working towards reunion with the Orthodox. Their main reasons for this assertion were that the American

¹ A full account of these movements will be found in Professor P. E. Shaw's *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches, 1820-1870* and in *The History of Protestant Missions in the Near East*, by Julius Richter. See also art. 'The Greek Mission of the Episcopal Church, 1828-1899,' by E. R. Hardy, Jr., in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, vol. X, pp. 183 ff.

² *Das Evangelische Bistum in Jerusalem*, sec. 70.

Church was not trammelled by State control; the relations between Russia and the United States were uniformly friendly and the "actual juxtaposition of the two Churches in the possessions on the Pacific, recently ceded to the American Government by Russia" (i.e., the Aleutian Islands and the purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1867).¹

This Memorial, "answering to reflections from within the Episcopal Church, widened the scope of the Eastward movement and strengthened the confidence of its leaders. The Russo-Greek Committee had now passed the experimental stage. With its Report to the General Convention in 1871, a new era may be said to have begun in the history of American and Eastern Church relations."² This American Russo-Greek Committee started with a clearly anti-Papal intention, using Anglo-Orthodox *rapprochement* as a buttress against Rome. But the Rev. J. F. Young, who was Secretary of the Committee, did say in a letter to George Williams, that he prayed "that these preliminary steps towards a restoration of the long lost communion of the East and the West, may prove but the harbinger of a restored Catholic Unity, unto the fulfilment of the Redeemer's earnest prayer."³

In the year 1870 Alexander Lycurgos, Archbishop of Syros and Tenos, visited England to consecrate the new Greek church at Liverpool. He visited and talked with a number of leading Churchmen, including Dr. Pusey, Mr. Gladstone, Bishop Christopher Wordsworth and several others, while the Rev. George Williams was assigned to him as guide and interpreter. "Before leaving Liverpool Archbishop Lycurgos received a deputation from a branch of the English Church Union, who presented to him an address of welcome, in which they spoke of their hopes that intercommunion might ultimately be restored. He answered by warmly reciprocating their desires, and said that he should count himself happy if he could co-operate in their 'God-pleasing exertions' to that end; and 'more happy still if the Lord should vouchsafe him to see in his days the Anglican Church and the time-honoured mother of all churches, firmly

¹ The text of the Memorial is contained in *Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 1878, Appendix IV.

² Shaw, *American Contacts with the Eastern Churches*, p. 12.

³ *Papers of the Russo-Greek Committee*, vol. I, p. 16. The committee consisted of Bishops de Lancey, Williams and Whitehouse; Revs. Drs. Mahan and Thrall and the Rev. J. F. Young, all "High Churchmen".

knit together and indissolubly united, not only in the bonds of love, but also by identity of doctrine.'"¹

Dr. Pusey had joined the E.C.A. at its inception in 1864. "But the bright hopes of the possibility of Reunion with the Churches of the East, which at that time he had entertained, and had expressed in some of the closing pages of the First Eirenicon, had now faded away before the impracticable attitude of the Russian Church. He also began to feel that the hold of English Churchmen upon the truth expressed in the *Filioque* clause of the Nicene Creed was being undermined by the language which some of the ardent advocates of Reunion allowed themselves to use with regard to it . . . when he thought it clear that the action of the Eastern Church Association was endangering that clause, he quietly ceased to be a member of it. . . ."² Bishop Walter Kerr Hamilton of Salisbury, on the other hand, though he does not appear to have joined the E.C.A., was a warm supporter during this time of Anglican-Eastern *rapprochement*. "He willingly furnished clergymen who were travelling in the East with letters of commendation to the Eastern Bishops. He earnestly insisted upon the duty of deferential bearing on our part towards the representatives of those venerable Churches. His last act of intercourse with the East was to send a respectful greeting to Philaret, then Metropolitan of Moscow, on the occasion of his Jubilee in August, 1867. He did not overrate the value of these courtesies: but he did not underrate them. Long before full intercommunion could be re-established, the minds of separated Churches must be penetrated by a spirit of which reciprocal courtesies are the stimulant and the expression; and if moral barriers, such as the pride of race and the pride of mere material civilization, could be removed, questions of doctrine and discipline would, at any rate, be approached with a much better chance of ultimate adjustment."³

In March, 1865, the Liturgy of the Greek Church was celebrated in Trinity Church, New York City, by a Greek monk, Father Agapius Honcharenko. This was the first time within modern history that the Greek Liturgy had been celebrated in a Western church. The celebration was organized by the Russo-Greek Committee, with the full approval of Bishop Horatio

Potter of New York, and was attended by some fifty priests of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

From 1870 onwards in England, and also largely in America, the movement for closer relations with the Eastern Churches, with a view to ultimate *réunion* with them, has passed out of the hands of the Catholic Revival as such, into being the practical policy of the Anglican Church as a whole; but the fact that this is so is due directly to such devoted sons of the Oxford Movement as John Mason Neale, George Williams and their associates of the earlier period, and their successors in such men as W. J. Birkbeck and Athelstan Riley.

¹ Skene, *Life of Alexander Lycurgus, Archbishop of the Cyclades*, p. 80.

² *Life of . . . Pusey*, vol. IV, p. 293.

³ Liddon, *Walter Kerr Hamilton, Bishop of Salisbury*, pp. 100-101.

VI

"HOME REUNION"

THE question of what later came to be called "Home Reunion"—reunion, that lay between the Church of England and the Protestant Churches in England—had entered hardly at all into the minds or calculations of the early Tractarians. "My own duties have not brought me into contact with dissenters", wrote Dr. Pusey in the first *Eirenicon*,¹ and the same was largely true of his colleagues of the earlier period. The Tractarian attitude to Protestant Dissent is, perhaps, best summarized by William Palmer of Worcester College in two articles he contributed to *The British Magazine* in June and July, 1832, in which, having dealt with the rise of Rationalism, he concluded that all Dissenters were becoming disillusioned and that "the Church will ultimately afford them a refuge from despair". The Dissenters, however, were still active enough in the political field, and were bent upon legislation which should greatly curtail the privileges of the Establishment; indeed, in the eyes of the Tractarians, their activities in this sphere were threatening the whole fabric of the National Church. "The defence of Church principles" came, therefore, to mean the defence of them against Dissent, and this was not the most hopeful ground upon which to seek means of reconciliation.

There was added to this the fact that the Tractarian theory of the Church forbade them to recognize the Protestant Dissenters as having any part in it. "Let us be charitable towards our dissenting brethren," said Dr. Jelf in a sermon in 1842, "kindly affectioned, patient, beneficent after our power, but in matters connected with religion give them no countenance by any co-operation of ours; let us in such matters refuse the right hand of fellowship to those, whose hands, whether intentionally or unintentionally, are employed in tearing the seamless vesture of Christ."²

In *The Churchman's Manual*, which was a product of the famous

¹ P. 12.

² *Via Media: or the Church of England our Providential Path between Romanism and Dissent*, p. 35.

Hadleigh Conference,¹ there is a long section dealing with Protestant Dissent, which concludes with the following question and answer:

"70. How should the members of the Church feel and act towards those who divide the body of Christians by their sects and unauthorized teachers?

"A. They should be sorry for them, and pray to God to forgive them, and bring them to a better mind: and be very careful that they do not themselves afford any encouragement to the error: 'not counting them as enemies, but admonishing them as brethren'."²

Dr. Pusey, in his Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1842, showed clearly, in dealing with the Jerusalem Bishopric, what was the Tractarian attitude to "reunion schemes" and to the spirit of compromise in order to attain outward unity:

"Still less, I own, can I see . . . how the picture of a united Church could be presented by an English and Lutheran congregation, of which the one holds 'One Holy Catholic Church, throughout all the world', knit together by its Bishops, as 'joints and bands', under its One Head, Christ, and joined on by unbroken succession to the Apostles; the other, an indefinite number of Churches, hanging together by an agreement in a scheme of doctrine framed by themselves, and modified by the civil power: of which the one holds Confirmation to be the act of the Bishop, the other deems such unnecessary but accepts it for its younger members: the one holds Ordination to be derived from the Apostles; the other, that Presbyters, uncommissioned, may confer it, and that those on whom it has been so conferred, may consecrate the Holy Eucharist: the one recites the Creed of Nicæa, the other has laid it aside: in the one, ancient prayer, the inspired Psalms, and hearing God's Word, are the chief part of their weekly service; in the other, uninspired hymns and preaching, with prayer extempore; the one kneel in prayer, the other not even at the Holy Eucharist: with the one, the Lord's Day is a Holy Day, with the other a holyday: the one receives

¹ The Hadleigh Conference was held ten days after Keble's Assize Sermon and some five weeks before the publication of the first of the *Tracts for the Times*; those present at it were R. H. Froude, H. J. Rose, A. P. Perceval and William Palmer of Worcester College. This conference led the Oxford party to see the need for united action and indirectly resulted in the *Tracts*. Here, in Dean Church's phrase, "the foundations of the Oxford Movement were laid".

² Quoted, Perceval, *Collection of Papers* . . . , p. 58.

'the Faith' as 'once for all delivered to the saints'; the other, as susceptible to subsequent correction and development: the one rests her authority and the very titles of her existence on being an Ancient Church, the other boasts itself modern: the one, not founded by man, but descended of that founded on the Day of Pentecost; the other dating itself truly from Luther, and claiming to be the parent of all, not in outward communion with the great Eastern and Western Branches, and so of our own Church by whom it was originally converted: the one recognizes and has been recognized by the Ancient Church of the East, the other rejects her and is anathematized by her.'¹

Such statements as those were characteristic of the Tractarian and early sub-Tractarian attitude towards Protestantism in general. This was to some extent inevitable: The Tractarian Movement, as we have seen, had at its inception a limited and insular aim, and although the insistence upon the Catholicity of the Church of England led naturally and rapidly to a realization of affinity with the rest of the Catholic Church conceived as existing in three great branches, Protestantism, lying outside those branches, remained without their scope. This view was not discarded by the later followers of the Oxford Movement, but they did, to some extent, change their attitude with regard to the problems raised by it. William Palmer's prophecy concerning the speedy dissolution of the Nonconformist bodies had not been fulfilled, and their existence faced the Catholic Movement with a problem that had to be met; it was increasingly seen to be wrong to ignore the large and active Christian bodies in England itself, which, although separated from the Church, were none the less attempting to live the Christian life in sincerity and truth.

In 1867² there was held at Wolverhampton a Church Congress attended by many prelates who were in England for the Lambeth Conference. After this Congress, at which the subject of reunion had occupied a considerable space, a self-constituted committee formed itself to explore the question of reunion with Dissenters, whom it sought to win by way of compromise. This venture was a total failure, and in 1878 it was absorbed into the Home

¹ Letter . . . (1842), pp. 106-108 (2nd ed.).

² Canon Ollard, *Reunion*, p. 124, and *Dictionary of English Church History*, art. "Reunion," gives the date of this Congress as 1869, but this is inaccurate, see *The Guardian*, October 9, 1867, and *The Times*, September 30-October 12, 1867.

Reunion Society. This Society had been founded in 1873 by a devoted Anglican layman, Mr. A. T. Mowbray, assisted by the Rev. Thomas Kirk, and in 1875 Bishop Harold Browne of Winchester became President of it, and the late Lord Nelson Chairman. Lord Nelson was a loyal and devoted son of the Oxford Movement, and he threw his energies heart and soul into the new venture, which became the absorbing interest of his life. The aims of the society were quite definite and its principles uncompromising: "The purpose of the Society shall be to present the Church of England in a conciliatory attitude towards those who regard themselves as outside her pale, so as to lead to the corporate reunion of all Christians holding the doctrines of the Ever-Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Society, though it cannot support any scheme of comprehension compromising the three Creeds, or the Episcopal Constitution of the Church, will be prepared to advocate all reasonable liberty in matters not contravening the Church's Faith, Order or Discipline."¹

The aims of the Society on this matter were further summed up in a speech by Lord Nelson: "Two things must be clearly understood. First, that the Church's desire for unity is based solely on a desire for the promotion of our common Christianity and for the advancement of the Kingdom of our common Lord. And all ideas of worldly triumph at the reconciliation of those who have gone from us, or of worldly aggrandizement and power that might accrue to the Church as a political body must be utterly discarded from our consideration. Secondly, that while we recognize in these movements among our Nonconformist brethren a right desire, we must avoid the danger of satisfying this with a sham. The unity to be sought must be real, and based on sound foundations. It must be a unity by which we can be truly united with the whole Church from the beginning. In our common warfare against infidelity and error, it will not do to ignore 1500 years of living Christianity; blotting out the labour of those who, having fought the good fight while on earth, now form the greatest proportion of the Great Church at rest in the Paradise of God—that glorious company of witnesses before whom we are privileged to contend."²

¹ *Constitution of the Home Reunion Society*, Art. 2.

² *Home Reunion*: Two Papers read at the Truro Diocesan Conference, 1881, p. 6.

"We cannot give up our Faith, there would be nothing for us to fight for then," said Bishop Browne in a sermon on the Society, "So we cling to the ancient Creeds, in which all foundation faith is summed up. We must have an organization, or it is impossible to live and work together. None can be simpler, none other for all men is possible, except that organization, which we have inherited through the long lapse of ages from the first century of the Faith. On these we take our stand, and then we throw our arms and our hearts open to all."¹

The most important work done by the Home Reunion Society was the publication of its occasional papers, which contrived to set forth the Catholic doctrine on controverted subjects in a manner at once firm and conciliatory. The Society also organized lectures, sermons and addresses up and down the country, many of which were published, and from time to time it organized competitions among its members for prize essays on some subject connected with reunion. But the main work of the Society was summed up by Lord Nelson as:

"(1) Frequent private and public prayer for unity; (2) special reunion services, with sermons on the subject; (3) the removal of abuses and defects which may justly give offence to the Nonconformists; (4) lectures on the history, doctrines and formularies of our Church, and the circulation of literature likely to advance the work for unity; (5) the promotion of greater social intercourse between Churchmen and Nonconformists, and the appointment of joint conferences to be held with them."

The greater part of its organization was carried on by its indefatigable Chairman, Horatio, third Earl Nelson; to him its major success was due, and when he died in 1913 the Home Reunion Society virtually died with him. It did good work on a line too much neglected by followers of the Oxford Movement, and it numbered among its warm supporters such men as Bishop George Howard Wilkinson, A. J. Mason, P. G. Medd, T. Outram Marshall, Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, Dean Oakley, Thomas Chamberlain, Canon (later Bishop) Edward King and many more.

¹ *A Sermon* (in St. Peter's, Eaton Square, 1876), p. 14.

VII

THE OLD CATHOLICS

IT is primarily from the ranks of the followers of the Oxford Movement that Anglican friendship for the Old Catholics has been developed, though it is clear that this friendship was also fostered from outside the Movement by the Anglo-Continental Society under Frederick Meyrick, who was willing to give his friendship to any movement that was anti-Papal, though he had no great understanding of the positive Catholicism of the Church of Utrecht.¹ Anglican interest in Utrecht itself dates from the publication in 1858 of J. M. Neale's *History of the So-called Jansenist Church of Holland*. When Dr. Neale first went to Utrecht in 1851 "there was not", he says, "a single work in English which treated of the subject."² . . . They (the members of the Church of Utrecht) scarcely exist in any number, except in Holland, where they are now reduced to five thousand."³

Neale in this book nowhere hinted at the subject of reunion, and even after its publication, monument of research as it was, English interest in the Church of Utrecht was restricted to a very small number of persons. It was not, indeed, until Utrecht joined with the Old Catholics that interest became more acute.

The Old Catholic movement was made possible by Dr.

¹ See, for example, the publications of the Anglo-Continental Society, e.g., *Correspondence between Members of the Anglo-Continental Society and (1) Old Catholics, (2) Oriental Churchmen*, ed. Meyrick; also Meyrick's *The Old Catholics and the Anglo-Continental Society*. The Church of Utrecht was the group of clergy and laity in Holland who refused assent to the Bull *Unigenitus* (1713) condemning the Jansenist heresy, though themselves Orthodox. Having an Archbishop at Utrecht and Suffragans at Haarlem and Deventer, their Orders are recognized as valid by Rome. The Old Catholics were those who refused to accept the decrees of the Vatican Council; they united with the Church of Utrecht in 1889 at the Conference of Utrecht, their first Bishop having been consecrated in 1873 by the Bishop of Deventer.

² But in the same year Dr. S. P. Tregelles published a small book, *The Jansenists, their Rise, Persecutions by the Jesuits, and existing Remnant*, nearly half of which was devoted to an account of the Church of Utrecht.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. v. It is difficult to arrive at the present numbers of the Church of Utrecht, it is only a comparatively small body. The Old Catholics proper are much more numerous and widespread, though their numbers are not always easy to determine, owing to the fondness of certain disreputable ecclesiastical organizations in England and America for assuming the name. The best short account in English of Old Catholicism is *The Old Catholic Churches and Reunion*, by Dr. C. B. Moss. Neale remains the standard English history.

Ignatius von Döllinger when he rallied together those Roman Catholics in Germany and elsewhere who refused to accept the Vatican Decrees concerning the Infallibility of the Pope, though he himself counselled against schism and refused to join the body, preferring to die an excommunicated Roman Catholic. Dr. von Döllinger had a number of firm friends in England, and several of his works were known in translations prepared by H. N. Oxenham. In 1874 Dr. Döllinger issued invitations to a reunion conference at Bonn. The Conference was held in August of that year, and was attended mainly by Old Catholics, Anglicans and Orthodox; no member of the Church of Utrecht was present or seems to have been invited. The most influential Anglicans attending were Dr. Liddon, who later prefaced the English translation of the Report of the Conference, Bishop Harold Browne of Winchester and E. S. Talbot, then Warden of Keble College. "The Bonn Conference was a tentative effort," wrote Liddon. "It left large tracts of controversy untouched. It dealt very partially even with those controverted subjects which were under discussion. But something was done, it may be humbly hoped, towards a more complete work in the future."¹ During the Conference Dr. Döllinger asserted that he had "no manner of doubt as to the validity of the episcopal succession in the English Church".²

In the following year a second, and more important, conference was held at Bonn, which was attended by no fewer than fifty Anglicans, as well as Old Catholics, Orthodox and seven German Evangelicals. The most important feature of the Second Bonn Conference was the adoption of certain articles in which the Old Catholics and Orthodox reached agreement on the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost and on the meaning and status of the *Filioque* clause.³ Unhappily these conferences were without visible result.

¹ *Report of the Proceedings at the Reunion Conference held at Bonn . . . 1874*, p. xxvi.

² *Ibid.*, p. 51.

³ An interesting comment on this is Professor Ivan T. Ossinine's *An Eastern View of the Second Conference at Bonn* (E.T. privately printed at Boston, 1876). The articles agreed upon relative to the *Filioque* clause were as follows:

(1) "We agree together in receiving the oecumenical symbols and the doctrinal decisions of the ancient undivided Church."

(2) "We agree together in acknowledging that the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner."

The work of seeking union with the Old Catholics was not long confined to being that of the followers of the Oxford Movement, and in a comparatively short time it became a general aspiration of the Anglican Communion. The bishops at the Lambeth Conference in 1878 had been somewhat vague and lukewarm on the subject,¹ but the Conference of 1888 issued a detailed report on the subject in which the various national Old Catholic Churches were considered separately. In regard to Utrecht itself the bishops said: "As regards ourselves, the Church of Holland is found on inquiry to be in agreement with our Church in many points, and we believe that with more frequent brotherly intercourse many of the barriers which at present separate us might be removed."² While with regard to the German Old Catholics they said: "We see no reason why we should not admit their Clergy and faithful Laity to Holy Communion on the same conditions as our own Communicants, and we also acknowledge the readiness which they have shown to offer spiritual privileges to members of our own Church."³ The same privileges were offered to the Swiss Old Catholics, but denied to the Austrians on the ground that they were not yet "sufficiently tried and complete to warrant a more formal relation on our part at the present time". (The Austrians, in fact, did not have a bishop until Adalbert Schindelaar was consecrated in 1925.)

Two old Catholic Bishops, Reinkens from Germany and Herzog from Switzerland, had actually visited England in 1881 and communicated publicly in Anglican churches.⁴ In his Lenten Pastoral of that year Bishop Huzog had observed that he regarded the question of intercommunion as settled by his performance of spiritual functions in America in 1880 and by a united Communion service in the old Catholic cathedral at Berne in 1879 at which the chalice was administered by the Bishop of Edinburgh (Dr. Cotterill).

Dr. Liddon, who had been a close personal friend of Dr. von Döllinger and a keen supporter of Old Catholicism at the time of

(3) "We acknowledge on all sides the representation of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as set forth by the Fathers of the undivided Church."

(4) "We reject every proposition and every method of expression in which in any way the acknowledgement of two Principles of *όπωι* or *αλτιών* in the Trinity may be contained."

¹ See *The Six Lambeth Conferences, 1867-1920*, pp. 94-95.

² *Ibid.*, p. 163.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

⁴ Moss, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

the Bonn Conferences, expressed himself in a letter in 1888 as disquieted by the direction in which the Old Catholic body was moving: ". . . During the last ten years there have been considerable changes in the Old Catholic body. In more than one way they have abandoned the position in which they found themselves in 1870, after the Vatican Definition. Their abandonment of clerical celibacy has alienated Dr. Döllinger and Professor Reusch; and the lay element in their synods, in itself anomalous, is, for those who know something of the ingredients which compose it, a matter for anxiety. I should fear that it may mean that they are drifting, or likely to drift."¹

Subsequent Lambeth Conferences repeated their assurances of goodwill towards the Old Catholics and their desire for closer relations until, in 1925, the Church of Utrecht itself, which had pursued a more cautious policy, declared "without reservation, that the Apostolic Succession has not been broken in the Church of England".²

In 1930 Old Catholic bishops were present at the Lambeth Conference, and a resolution was passed by the Conference asking that a commission be appointed to discuss points of agreement and difference between the two Churches. The commission was appointed, and met an Old Catholic commission at Bonn in 1931, when intercommunion was formally established between the two Churches,³ after the commission's findings and recommendations had been accepted by the Convocations.

¹ Johnston, *Life and Letters of Henry Parry Liddon*, p. 359.

² Moss, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-63.

³ See *Report of the Meeting of the Commission of the Anglican and the Old Catholic Churches held at Bonn on Thursday, July 2, 1931*.

VIII

THE ORDER OF CORPORATE REUNION

THIS strange and short-lived venture at reunion with the Holy See was inaugurated in 1877¹ by Drs. F. G. Lee, T. W. Mossman² and J. T. Seccombe, a Norfolk medical man and a magistrate.³ In the summer of that year, by some means or other, of which various stories are told and different theories are held, the three persons involved underwent some form of episcopal consecration by bishops the validity of whose Orders Rome was said to be bound to recognize. So much is certain. The rest of the story with regard to the consecration is largely conjectural. It appears that the reason for the venture was a desire to restore gradually to the Anglican Church an episcopal succession which none could dispute. It does not appear that the promoters came actually to disbelieve in the validity of Anglican Orders, and Lee, who had in 1869 published a learned defence of them, asserted many years later that he had never abandoned the position there adopted.

¹ It is stated, however, in an apparently well-informed article in *The Church Times* of April 28th, 1922, that "in 1874 an Order of corporate Reunion was founded, owing its inspiration undoubtedly to that devoted worker for the Reunion of Christendom, Mr. Ambrose de Lisle Phillipps, of Garendon Park, near Loughborough . . . and three bishops were consecrated for it before July 1877."—See, *A Chapter of Secret History*, reprinted by kind permission of 'The Church Times' . . . together with *Sundry Notes*, by F. E. Langholt, p. 5.

² A Lincolnshire incumbent, and the author of various volumes, probably best known as the translator of the *Commentary of Cornelius a Lapide*.

³ A full account of the O.C.R. will be found in the present writer's forthcoming biography of F. G. Lee, wherein are given reasons for rejecting the current theory of these consecrations. Printed accounts of the Order are in Lee, *Life of Cardinal Pole*, pp. 263 ff.; *The Nineteenth Century*, November 1881, art. "The Order of Corporate Reunion", by Lee, and a further article by him in the same review for November 1888, "The O.C.R. and its Work". The S.S.C. in 1878 issued a *Statement . . . concerning the Order of Corporate Reunion*; the Order issued *The Reunion Magazine* (1877-79), of which only four numbers appeared. Criticisms of the Order were *The Order of Corporate Reunion*, by T. Livius, C.S.S.R. (Dublin, 1882); *Dr. Lee and Corporate Reunion*, by John Morris (1888), and a series of articles by Bishop C. C. Grafton in *The Anglo-Catholic*. Walter Walsh's account in *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement* is partially accurate. Modern references are Ollard & Crosse, *Dictionary of English Church History*, art. "Reunion"; Slosser, *Christian Unity*, pp. 203 ff.; Ollard, *Reunion*, pp. 37 ff.; *Southwark Diocesan Gazette*, art. "Dr. Lee of Lambeth", by H. R. T. Brandreth, June 1939. At its inception the Order issued a *Pastoral Letter* which went into several editions.

The O.C.R. was not merely a failure, it was a gross blunder, and only prompt action on the part of loyal Anglo-Catholics prevented its consequences from being serious. Indeed, the one true service it did perform was the opportunity it gave for loyal followers of the Oxford Movement to repudiate it, and so to make their position plain with regard to underground methods of obtaining union. The whole affair was masked in secrecy, and the names of the consecrating prelates were never divulged, except in the Confessional to those intending to join the Order. Very few re-ordinations appear to have taken place, and the names of those so re-ordained were never divulged, though a few of them subsequently came to light. Nor were any other prelates consecrated, though certain ecclesiastical adventurers in later years claimed to have been consecrated by Lee.

Mossman attempted to affiliate the O.C.R. with the Society of the Holy Cross, which was thus compelled to set up a committee to enquire into the subject.¹ The result of that investigation was that the S.S.C. was regrettably compelled to expel Mossman from its ranks and to issue a stern condemnation of the principles of the Order. The S.S.C., it must be remembered, consisted of those who were considered most "extreme" in the Catholic direction. Within a few years the whole movement had petered out; Mossman died in 1882, being received into the Roman Church by Cardinal Manning on his death-bed; Seccombe appears never to have exercised his episcopal Orders at all and to have retired from the Movement while Lee himself was thoroughly disillusioned by the whole affair.

The reasons for the failure of the O.C.R. are interesting, as they show clearly the mind of the great body of sub-Tractarians on the subject of Catholic reunion. The main trouble was, quite clearly and apart from later extravagances to which the O.C.R. gave way, that the very existence of such a body within the Anglican Communion seemed to imply a disbelief either in the validity of her Orders or in the Catholicity of her status. A further objection put forward by the sub-Tractarians was that the Order appeared to suppose that the chief barrier to unity with Rome was to be found in the widespread Roman disbelief in the validity of Anglican ordinations. For the sub-Tractarians the main barrier was to be found in the Vatican Decrees, which

¹ A full account of this will be found in *The Catholic Movement and the S.S.C.*, by J. Embry, pp. 139-145.

members of the Order appeared to accept, though their statements on this were conflicting. The sub-Tractarians were surely right in insisting that before all else the doctrinal difficulties of the majority of Anglicans on the subject of the Papacy must be resolved.¹ When this was done, as they clearly saw, the question of Orders would fall into place naturally. However, as events turned out, the next major event on the reunion stage was also concerned with the question of Orders.

Roman Catholics in England were almost unanimous in condemning the Order, though Manning was unaccountably silent on the subject. The Roman objection was that if the O.C.R. had indeed acquired valid Orders by some illicit means, then that act was in itself sacrilegious, as were the Sacraments conferred as a result of it. So Father Livius: ". . . the clerical members of the O.C.R., by their clandestine ordination, their heretical or schismatical succession; their reception of other sacraments; their exercise of Orders, in saying Mass, ordaining and administering the Sacraments; by their new-formed basis of faith; their appeal to a General Council; their constitution of episcopal sees—by each and all of these several acts—incurred, *ipso facto*, according to the law of the Catholic Church, not only criminal clerical irregularity, but suspension and excommunication *latæ sententiae*."²

It would not be right to leave the subject of the Order of Corporate Reunion without allowing one of its principal instigators to speak in its defence. Writing in *The Nineteenth Century* in November, 1898, Dr. Lee said: "To look back twenty years, most broad and lofty was the position which the O.C.R. took up. The principles were founded on a rock; its constructive and charitable policy still efficiently energises. Whatever may happen in England prior to a line of demarcation being finally drawn between Catholicity and Unbelief—a position not unlikely to be occupied ere long, and for which all should be prepared—those great principles can never with safety be disregarded. The retiring and thoughtful among us—on the Bench, in Convocation, and in appointed office—see the position of the Order more clearly and definitely, and look upon the

¹ So the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool, addressing the Seven Years Association at Sheffield in 1937, ". . . that doctrine which unhappily most of all divides us; the divine institution of the Papacy as set forth in Holy Writ."—*The Beda Review*, March 1938.

² *The Order of Corporate Reunion*, p. 28.

methods of its founders as well deserving of the most respectful consideration. These methods—intended to mend and make, not to reform and destroy—are expressly based on the Christian practice set forth in the Book of Common Prayer of conditional baptism. For without baptism there is no actual Christianity. What follows consequently from such an official act being done is equally applicable to confirmation, holy orders, and all priestly labours. Wheresoever any uncertainty exists, a remedy should be found and applied."

In 1908 another *episcopus vagans*, Arnold Harris Mathew, attempted to form an Order of Corporate Reunion, but this had no connection with Dr. Lee's movement, though in some of its literature it appeared to claim it.

IX

"LEO XIII AND ANGLICAN ORDERS"

THE story of the Papal enquiry into Anglican ordinations has been told so frequently and so thoroughly that no more than a brief sketch of it need be given here.¹ Briefly the story is this.

In the spring of 1889 the late Lord Halifax, who had been President of the English Church Union since 1868 and, since the death of Dr. Pusey, the virtual leader of the Catholic party, was staying in Madeira, where he met a French priest, the Abbé Fernand Portal. From this chance meeting a close intimacy sprang up between the two men and a long correspondence ensued on the subject of Anglicanism and reunion generally. "In Portal Halifax at once discovered a sympathetic companion. His charm, his gaiety, his infectious laugh, his enthusiasm, and above all his spiritual zeal impressed themselves upon all who met him. Like Halifax, he had a mind which minimized difficulties by comparison with ultimate ends, a characteristic which was the strength, as well as the weakness, of both men."²

Halifax in England, and Portal in France, interested others in the cause of reunion, and a number of conversations and meetings took place. In 1894 several works on the subject of Anglican Orders were published, the series beginning with Portal's own work, published under the *nom de plume* of "Fernand Dalbus", and entitled *Les Ordinations anglicanes*; others who published works on the same subject in that year were Mgr. Louis Duchesne, Mgr. Gasparri and Dr. John Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury. In the following year a number of other treatises on the subject appeared and a periodical, *La Revue Anglo-Romaine*, was founded

¹ The best accounts are *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders* by Lord Halifax; *A Roman Diary and other Documents relating to the Papal Enquiry into Anglican Orders*, by T. A. Lacey, which is a day-to-day diary of events and letters during the session of the Commission and contains a full bibliography; the fourth chapter of the second volume of Mr. J. G. Lockhart's *Charles Lindley, Viscount Halifax*, which is in all ways most admirable. Cardinal Gasquet's *Leaves from my Diary, 1894-96*, gives an account from the Roman side. See also *The Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, by J. G. Snead-Cox, vol. II, and the second volume of A. C. Benson's *Life and Letters of Archbishop Benson*.

² Lockhart, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 42.

to further the cause, and was edited by Portal. By this time representations had been made to Rome to issue an enquiry into the validity of Anglican ordinations, and in April, 1895, Pope Leo XIII issued his Apostolic Letter *Ad Anglos* (*Amantissima Voluntatis*).¹ In September of that year it was known that he intended to open a full enquiry on the subject. A Commission was set up in Rome to study the question, and assembled in March, 1896. It consisted of Dom (later Cardinal) Aidan Gasquet, Canon Moyes, Mgr. (later Cardinal) Gasparri, the Abbé Duchesne, Fr. David Fleming, a Franciscan, and a Jesuit Fr. de Augustinis. Father F. W. Puller, S.S.J.E., and Canon T. A. Lacey went to Rome to give unofficial help to the Commission. Two further members were later added to the Commission, Fr. Scannell and Fr. Jose Calasanzio de Lleveneras, a Spanish Capuchin. The Secretary of the Commission was Mgr. (later Cardinal) Merry del Val. In September, 1896, appeared the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, declaring Anglican Orders null and void.

It is important to realize that the Church of England was in no way begging for a papal decision in favour of her Orders; she had no doubt whatever as to their validity. The whole enquiry was initiated merely as a first step towards full discussions on reunion. In an article in the first number of *La Revue Anglo-Romaine* Portal made this clear from the Roman side: "To-day we found *La Revue Anglo-Romaine* to labour with all our might at the work of reunion which is going on in the Christian world, and in particular at the union of the Anglican Church with the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church." It would be useless to deny, however, that the Bull came as a bitter shock to all concerned, a shock for which they were to the end quite unprepared. Once again it was the policy of Westminster, this time in the person of Cardinal Vaughan, which had triumphed.² Writing to Lord Halifax just after the event, Portal said: "May our Lord have pity on us. May He at least grant us the consolation of seeing with our eyes that we have not done more harm than good. You and yours have shown too much faith, too much abnegation, for your praiseworthy acts and your sacrifices of every kind to be lost. They will greatly help the salvation of your souls, and also, contrary to all hope, I hope, to reunion."³

¹ An English translation is in *Messenger*, *op. cit.*, pp. 14 ff.

² See Sneed-Cox, *op. cit.*, caps v and vi.

³ Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, p. 357.

Mr. Lockhart states Halifax's final view of the matter: "At least he believed that *Apostolicae Curae*, if it could not be set aside, could be explained, and in a fashion satisfactory to Anglicans, when the right moment arrived and the decision could be shown to rest upon an incomplete appreciation of the facts. That was a slender consolation; he found a more substantial advantage in the actual re-opening of negotiations between the members of two Churches which, for more than three hundred years, had been at worst at war, and at best at armed neutrality; and yet another gain in the new attitude of Anglicans, who had explored their pedigree and learnt to put a new value upon their birthright."¹

As in 1864 all hope of union had seemed at an end, and six years after that, when men were beginning once more to pick up the threads, the Vatican decrees had seemed to put an end to all hope a second time, so now in 1896 the Vatican seemed to have closed the door to every reasonable prospect of reunion. It was only after the first shock had passed that the Anglo-Catholic leaders began once more to find their bearings and to realize that, after all, no door to the will of God could be wholly closed and that there was more than a grain of truth in Abbé Portal's remark. Some words of Mr. Gladstone, whose championship of their cause was so great an encouragement to the English negotiators, sum up what he, and the majority of Anglicans with him, considered the pros and cons of the matter to be: "On the positive side, after all that has happened during the last (nearly) four centuries, the spontaneous effort of a Pope to deal with a controverted matter in a spirit of approximation and of peace, was a step full of advantage to the cause of religion, and entitled the high person taking it to the warmest and most grateful acknowledgements. And negatively, an authoritative condemnation of what every Roman theologian has hitherto been free to support, would be a grave evil hardening and widening religious discord."²

It was largely the Reply of the Anglican Archbishops—Temple and Maclagan—which saved the situation. W. J. Birkbeck wrote to Lord Halifax: "I expect that you are by this time rejoicing as much as I am over the Archbishops' Manifesto, at least if it is all as good as what appears in *The Times*. To think of the contrast which it presents to anything that could have come from

¹ Lockhart, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 86.

² *Gleanings of Past Years*, vol. VIII, p. 414.

the same quarter—say twenty years ago, when Tait and Thomson occupied the two Metropolitical Sees—is really a cause of deep thankfulness. To have the fact established *urbi et orbi*, that the views which we hold about the priesthood are those, not of a small school of recent growth, but of the Church of England from the Reformation downwards, is a matter for which we cannot be too thankful. It is the death-blow, not only to the false view of the English Church with which the English Romans deceived the Pope, but to the Protestant party in the Church of England. Never again will anyone be able to say that you put a false view of the English Church before the Holy Father!"¹ Again he wrote a little later: "I really feel beside myself with joy over the Archbishops' pronouncement. . . . If every journey to Rome could get such a document out of the English Bishops it would be worth spending the rest of our life on the railway backwards and forwards."²

The *Responsio* was not, of course, primarily the work of the Archbishops themselves; the first draft had been prepared by Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury, and the final document was mainly the work of the three outstandingly pre-eminent bishops on the bench—Wordsworth, Stubbs and Creighton. Archbishop Temple, however, took great personal pains over the document and "was determined from the first that every trace of bitterness should be eradicated from the draft."³

The type of falsehood current in Rome at this time concerning the Church of England is well seen in the Jesuit Salvatore M. Brandi's book, *La Condanna delle Ordinazioni Anglicane*, which received the especial approbation of the Pope, wherein the ultra-Evangelical school which produced the paper *The Rock* is spoken of as that which "constitutes by far the majority of members of the Anglican Church".⁴

In 1898 the Roman Catholic hierarchy in England issued *A Vindication of the Bull "Apostolice Curæ"* in reply to the Anglican Archbishops, which one young Roman Catholic priest, Fr. W. R. Carson, told his Roman Catholic readers they were at liberty to consider "as a singularly weak and inept piece of special

¹ *Life and Letters of W. J. Birkbeck*, p. 121.

² *Ibid.*, p. 122.

³ *Frederick Temple*, by Seven Friends, vol. II, p. 393.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 5.—"constituiscono purtroppo la Maggioranza de'membri della Chiesa anglicana."

pleading."¹ The *Vindication* was not an important document and did no more than repeat the old arguments. It did, however, in its second section, appear to claim some sort of infallibility for the Bull,² and this led Fr. Carson to write a valuable and important essay "On the Non-Infallible Dogmatic Force of the Bull *Apostolice Curæ*", which he published as an Appendix to his book *Reunion Essays* in 1903. In this essay, of course, Fr. Carson wrote merely as an individual, and his book narrowly escaped condemnation at Rome,³ but the essay was valuable as showing clearly that any attempt to declare the Bull infallible was false, since the subject-matter failed to fulfil at least one of the conditions laid down by the Vatican Council, and since the nature and style of the document itself were such as could not come within the scope of infallible pronouncements. On the concluding paragraph of the Bull, which reads: "We decree that these Letters and all things contained therein shall not be liable at any time to be impugned or objected to by reason of fault or any other defect whatsoever of subreption or obreption of our intention, but are and shall be always valid and in force, and shall be inviolably observed, both juridically and otherwise, by all of whatsoever degree and pre-eminence; declaring null and void anything which in these matters may happen to be contrariwise attempted, whether wittingly or unwittingly, by any person whatsoever by whatsoever authority or pretext, all things to the contrary notwithstanding." Fr. Carson was able to point out that this was precisely the manner in which the Bull *Dominus ac Redemptor Noster* of Pope Clement XIV, suppressing the Jesuits, ended. "Yet it is dead letter to-day and such, it is devoutly to be hoped in the interests of Christian unity, may be the fate, in God's good providence, of the equally peremptory Bull *Apostolice Curæ* of Pope Leo XIII".⁴

¹ *Reunion Essays*, p. 252 n.

² "We will begin by claiming for Leo XIII that he has exercised only his lawful authority in deciding this controversy about Anglican Orders. . . . If he does possess any authority over the Church, and is capable of passing final judgment in appeal upon any question, surely it must be upon so elementary, so practical, so vital a question as the valid administration of sacraments . . . to deny Leo XIII's competency to define the conditions of a valid sacrament is to strike at the very roots of the sacramental system."—*Vindication*, pp. 2-3.

³ Cardinal Vaughan, on his death-bed, wished the book condemned, see Snead-Cox, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 474.

⁴ Carson, *op. cit.*, p. 257 n. Carson died the year that this book was published, at the early age of twenty-nine; he was a convert to Rome, being the son of a Bedfordshire incumbent.

In spite of the setback administered by the Papal Bull, and the inevitable ill-feeling engendered by it, some forces at least were active beneath the surface to nullify its bad effects. In 1895 a book had appeared, *The Gift of the Keys and other Essays*, by the Rev. William Frederick Everest, Canon of Truro. The first essay covered 140 pages, and in it the writer aimed "to bring out the position of the English Church, in its present separation from Rome, as a purely provisional one, absolutely necessary under the circumstances, but to be ended the very moment it can be done without prejudice to the just claims of the Papacy on the one hand, and those of the divinely-derived and constituted Episcopacy on the other."¹

In this essay Mr. Everest examined closely the position of St. Peter in the New Testament and in the early Church, and concluded: "Am I wrong, then, in saying, as above, that a visible recognized head over Christendom has proved a *necessity* for the Church? For upwards of three hundred years the Church in this country has been pursuing an *acephalous* course, or rather its course apart from the Chair of St. Peter; and have its fruits been such as, tried by the Divine Canon, encourage a continuance in the same course? Let us not be beguiled by the stir and movement that is going on in what is called the religious world, as if it were a sign of undiseased and sound health. Let us remember that, with regard to all religious movements not doomed to perish, *truth* must be the 'life thereof'; and that 'the ground and pillar of truth', i.e. of *revealed truth*, is the Church."² The late Spencer Jones has told of the influence which this book had upon him when he was preparing the sermon which eventually grew into the book *England and the Holy See* which was destined to revive once more the school of Ward, Oakeley and Dalgairns within the Church of England.³

All these movements, however, were maturing underground; on the surface the reunion situation seemed dead indeed, so that Dr. T. A. Lacey, writing some few years later, was compelled to say: "It must be admitted that people have almost ceased to speak of union; since the promulgation of the Bull which condemns Anglican ordinations (1896), it has become almost impossible to treat of the question beneficially and openly. But

¹ Everest, *op. cit.*, pp. v-vi.

² *Ibid.*, p. 134.

³ Art. "Steps to Reunion" in *Reunion*, vol. I, pp. 14 ff.

people have not ceased to think about it. If the *present opportunity* of union is slight indeed, if we agree to recognize that the means by which it will come about are hidden from us, the *ultimate necessity* of this union is no longer seriously questioned by anyone."¹

The work of seeking *rapprochement* with the East was steadily advancing during these years. The E.C.A., following Dr. Neale's death in 1866 and that of George Williams in 1878, had virtually ceased to exist. In the early 1890's, however, mainly through the efforts of Bishop John Wordsworth and Dr. A. C. Headlam (from 1923-1945 Bishop of Gloucester), the Association was revived and began the short period of its greatest usefulness.

In the Association's *Report* for 1894 there is an interesting consideration of the kind of work it felt itself called upon to undertake: "Two points are clear. First that there is a definite opening, and one which will not demand any large expenditure. . . . What is required is that at three or four of the more important centres of the East, at Jerusalem, at Constantinople, in Egypt and in Cyprus, there should be one or more students who should be able to study the history and present condition of the Eastern Church and other Christian communities, and who would assist locally if occasion arises in organizing education, and other similar work. . . . A second point that the Association should keep before itself is that it should never attempt unauthorized work. Its representatives in the East must always go, not as representatives of a society, but directly or indirectly as representatives of the Church. . . . Probably the best scheme that can be suggested is that scholarships should be offered at the two Universities for men who have just taken their degree and are prepared to be ordained, in order that they may devote themselves to the study of theology, and of an Eastern language or languages. They would have to undertake in return to go to the East for a certain number of years in the service of the Association."²

This excellent plan could not be implemented fully, but in 1895 the Rev. H. T. F. Duckworth was sent by the Association to Cyprus, where he remained for a number of years and made a thorough study of the history and worship of the Cypriot Church. His valuable little book, published in 1901, *Greek Manuals of*

¹ Art. "La Situation présente de l'Eglise d'Angleterre" in *Revue catholique des Eglises*, March, 1908.

² E.C.A., *Report for 1894*, pp. 9-11.

Church Doctrine, is one of the fruits of his study there.¹ All through this period, too, the Bishop of the re-constituted Anglican See in Jerusalem, Dr. Popham Blyth, was working in close touch with the Association and giving his full support to its members in the Near East. At this time, too, the E.C.A. was receiving increasing support from the Anglican Episcopate, and in its 1896 *Report* we find three archbishops and thirty-one bishops among its patrons.

So ended the nineteenth century; a century during which activity to promote Christian unity had been more intensive and more widespread than during any other in the history of Christendom; a century which ended without any one of the breaches in Catholic Christendom being healed, but none the less a century which had laid many of the foundations of peace and one which had brought home to men of good will that the problem of reunion was primarily one, not of polemics, but of study, sacrifice and prayer.

¹ A valuable and interesting series of letters from him, giving accounts of his work and general information on the religious condition of Cyprus at this time, is published in the E.C.A. *Report for 1896*.

X

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

THE twentieth century has so far shown itself as a period in which the Church's hold over the mass of people has been less than probably any other in history. It is therefore not surprising that the century has also shown itself as one of most intense reunion activity. It is true that not all this activity has been of a kind of which the followers of the Oxford Movement can approve, none the less great strides forward have been made in the matter of Catholic reunion both in regard to the East and to the West.

The first decade of the century saw two notable events in the sphere of Catholic reunion. The first of these had reference to the East. Speaking at the end of the last century Dr. John Wordsworth had said: "If I am to summarize my experiences in the fewest words I should say that we need to aim at four things, three of which are clearly in our power:

"The first is regular intercourse between the representative clergy of England and the Patriarchates, in the way of letters of information as to changes in the occupancy of our chief sees, and visits properly arranged beforehand made in person.

"Secondly, we need to establish a system of mutual charity in regard to Church offices to the sick, the dying, and the dead, where clergy of their own communion are out of reach.

"Thirdly, we need to make clear that aggressive action in regard to members of either Communion is discountenanced, and as far as possible disallowed, by Church authorities on both sides.

"Fourthly, we may have various schemes of co-operation, in which Englishmen may reasonably be expected to take an interest, such as assistance to the Church of Constantinople in the circulation of the Scriptures in a form acceptable to the clergy and people, promotion of education in various directions, and literary co-operation. . . .

"The only one of these objects which I have mentioned, on which there is real difficulty, is the second. Some advance has

been made in respect to it, and I believe that further advance will grow naturally as time goes on, and all the more certainly if we are prudent enough to be patient about it.”¹

In 1906 a step was taken which was destined to give reality to these aspirations. This was the foundation of the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union. The E.C.A. still existed, but it was a small body, and after its short burst of life in the 1890’s had again become more or less inactive. The Union was conducted on active and progressive lines, and its policy was well stated in one of its Annual Reports: “The policy of the Union continues to be based on the principle that the Anglican, as part of the Catholic Church, is bound by her position to act as such in her relations with other parts, and to work for the restoration of the visible unity of the Church as a revealed ideal.”²

At the end of its first year the Union was able to report: “Considering the nature of the difficulties in this work of drawing Easterns into co-operation with Anglicans, the misunderstanding and ignorance of each other, and the special circumstances of Eastern Europe, the response has been remarkable, the list of members showing names of weight in both churches. The mere association of so many of both Churches in a common cause, is unprecedented and of great importance.”³

In 1914 the Eastern Church Association amalgamated with the Union to form the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association. It is impossible to over-emphasize the importance of this Association in furthering the work of *rapprochement* between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches, and it is due very largely to its efforts, and to the efforts of those who have worked within it, that cordial relations now exist between the Anglican Church and the Churches of the East.

The second event of importance was the publication in 1902 of a book entitled *England and the Holy See* by the Rev. Spencer Jones, an Anglican country clergyman. The book had grown out of a sermon preached by its author on St. Peter’s Day, 1900, in a series organized by the A.P.U.C. This book was a plea for a reconsideration of the Roman claims by members of the Church of England, and went further in its acceptance of explicit points

¹ *The Church of England and the Eastern Patriarchates: A Lecture delivered at Oxford to the Summer School of Clergy, 27th July, 1898*, pp. 23-24.

² *Second Annual Report*, p. 11.

³ *First Annual Report*, p. 8.

of Roman teaching than anything yet published by an Anglican. It aroused considerable interest, not only in England and America, but also on the Continent. “The book was translated into German; reviewed, I think, in every country in Europe, and in many instances made the subject of a series of special articles . . .” wrote its author many years later.¹ Later this led to the founding of a society, known as the “Society of St. Thomas of Canterbury, Students of the Church of the West”, which for a number of years held meetings addressed by Roman Catholics and Anglicans, among the former being such men as Abbot Gasquet, Abbot Chapman, Mgr. Moyes, Fr. Adrian Fortescue and many others. This, in turn, led to the founding of the Church Unity Octave, which organized prayer during the week of January 18th-25th each year for reunion with Rome, accepting as its dogmatic basis much of Roman teaching not normally accepted by the majority of Anglicans. Thus there was revived within the Church of England the older pro-Papal school which had first come into prominence in the days succeeding *Tract XC*.² The majority of Anglican “High Churchmen” have stood aloof from this development on the ground that it seeks absorption rather than reunion, but it is, none the less, merely a sharpened form of a spirit which made itself felt in the early days of the Revival and which has had a more or less continuous tradition since that time.

In spite, however, of these movements of advance, the main work of the Catholic Movement in the twentieth century has been one of defence against various attempts at reunion which have been seen to be opposed to the faith and order of the Church of England as interpreted by the Tractarians and their predecessors in Caroline times. This defence has been a painful work for the Catholic party, since it has inevitably brought upon them the charge of being indifferent to reunion with the Protestant communions. Their opposition, however, has been grounded, not upon objection to reunion with Protestants, but upon objection to certain methods of seeking that reunion. The doctrines of Bible and Church, as expounded by the Tractarians and their successors, point clearly to the view that all attempts to take short

¹ Art. “Steps to Reunion” in *Reunion*, vol. I, p. 37.

² The whole story of this revival is told by Spencer Jones in the series of articles in the first volume of *Reunion*. See also Donald Hole, *Anglican Papalists*, *passim*.

cuts to reach the goal of reunion are works of sentiment rather than of charity.

The first of these attempts at reunion which the Catholic party found it necessary to oppose, and one which to some degree has set the tone of the rest, was that which resulted from a missionary conference held at Kikuyu, in East Africa, in 1913. The proposals for reunion made at this conference were of a kind with which we are now familiar, though they did not go as far as subsequent proposals have done and the question of the Ministry was not discussed. In spite of this, however, the conference ended with an "Open Communion" celebrated by Bishop Peel of Mombasa. This led to action on the part of Dr. Frank Weston, Bishop of Zanzibar, who delayed the Bishop of Mombasa and the Bishop of Uganda, in whose diocese Kikuyu was situated and who was mainly responsible for the arrangements, to the Archbishop of Canterbury for heresy. A considerable controversy ensued and many pamphlets were published on both sides.¹ Archbishop Davidson referred the whole matter to the consultative committee of the Lambeth Conference, which, in the words of Dr. Weston's biographer, "was very sympathetic to the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa, and had not a word of sympathy for the Bishop of Zanzibar, but they justified him on all points which the Archbishop had submitted to them".² Following this, in 1915, Dr. Davidson issued an "Opinion" on the case, which pleased nobody. A distinguished scholar said of it at the time: "Let us consider what the Archbishop of Canterbury has lately done. A distinguished Scotsman, he has kindled resentment among his Presbyterian, and often deeply religious, compatriots. The Primate of All England, he has wounded the consciences of many thoughtful English Christians. Associated, I believe, with an official Russian society founded to promote sympathy between the

¹ The more important are: Davidson, *The Missionary Conference in East Africa* (1914) and *Kikuyu* (1915); Pullan, *Missionary Principles and the Primate on Kikuyu* (1915); N. P. Williams, *The Kikuyu Opinion* (1915); F. L. Boyd, *Facing Kikuyu* (1915); Kelway, *The Story of Kikuyu*; Weston, *The Case against Kikuyu*, all on the Catholic side. On the opposite side: *Steps towards Reunion*, by the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa (1914); Willis, *The Kikuyu Conference* (1913); Henson, *The Issue of Kikuyu* (1914). Other titles are in Brandreth, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-55. The whole story is well told in Maynard Smith, *Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar*, in chapter xlvi of Dr. Bell's *Randall Davidson* and, from the other side, in the first volume of Dr. Hensley Henson's *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*. A valuable book which emerged from the whole controversy was A. J. Mason's, *The Church of England and Episcopacy*.

² Maynard Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

Church of England and the Church of Russia, he has written a document which a Russian would regard with amazement and suspicion. The chief ecclesiastic of the almost world-wide communion represented at the Lambeth Conference of 1908, he has published a careful utterance which is hostile to the injunction of the two hundred and forty-two bishops at that conference, to the effect that 'care should be taken to do what will advance the reunion of the whole of Christendom, and to abstain from doing anything that will retard or prevent it'.¹ However, the excitement died down and, although the writing had plainly appeared on the wall, men were too busy fighting a war to ponder the deeper things of the Church of Christ, with the result of a progressive loss of territory to Catholics within the Church of England who, since that time, have been increasingly on the defensive.

The first world war gave a considerable impetus to the longing for reunion, and but three years after the cessation of hostilities there commenced the famous "Conversations of Malines". Much has been written about these meetings between Anglicans and Roman Catholics in Belgium, and the literature is too readily accessible to make a detailed study of them needful here.²

The initiative in the venture was taken by Lord Halifax, then in his eighty-third year, and his collaborator of earlier days, the Abbé Portal. The way had been paved by the "Appeal to all Christian People" of the 1920 Lambeth Conference, to which Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Malines and Primate of Belgium, had sent a friendly reply. In October, 1921, Halifax and Portal visited the Cardinal and proposed that he should sponsor conversations between selected Romans and selected Anglicans. To this proposal Cardinal Mercier agreed and the first Conversation was held in December of that year. The Anglicans were represented by Halifax, Dr. W. H. Frere, Superior of the Community of the Resurrection and later Bishop of Truro, and Dr. Armitage Robinson, Dean of Wells; Cardinal Mercier, Portal and Mgr. van Roey, the Cardinal's Vicar-General, represented the Romans.

¹ Pullan, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

² The principal literature is: *The Conversations at Malines, 1921-25: Official Report of the Anglican Participants*; *The Conversations at Malines, 1921-25: Official Documents*, edited by Lord Halifax; Halifax, *Notes on the Conversations at Malines: Points of Agreement*; Mercier, *Les Conversations de Malines . . . Lettre à son Clergé*; Frere, *Recollections of Malines*; Lockhart, *op. cit.*, vol. II; Bell, *op. cit.*, vol. II; Oldmeadow, Francis, *Cardinal Bourne*, vol. II.

Altogether four "Conversations" were held between 1921 and 1925 and after the death of Cardinal Mercier in the latter year, a fifth was held under the presidency of his successor, Mgr. van Roey, which was in the nature of a winding-up. The Anglican participants were joined for the later Conversations by Dr. Gore and Dr. B. J. Kidd; Mgr. Batiffol and the Abbé Hippolyte Hemmer being included on the Roman side.

The Conversations were, of course, unofficial and in a sense informal; neither the Anglicans nor the Roman Catholics were regarded as delegates of their Churches. On the other hand, both the Vatican and the Archbishop of Canterbury were informed of what was going forward, and the latter, at least, was given a full account of the proceedings. It is not surprising that the events of Malines were followed with considerable disquiet both by the Evangelical section of the Church of England and by the English Roman Catholics. To the Evangelicals the Archbishop of Canterbury himself issued a reply,¹ but Cardinal Mercier failed to allay the alarm of the English Roman Catholics and, indeed, by an unfortunate passage of words with Father Woodlock, a Jesuit controversialist, rendered it if anything more acute. Cardinal Bourne himself was early reported to be antagonistic, and complained bitterly of being virtually excluded from the proceedings. His biographer suggests that the reason why the affair was kept secret from him was that he knew so much more of Anglicanism than Cardinal Mercier, who admittedly knew very little. "No," says Mr. Oldmeadow, "Malines was chosen because Malines was ready to accept the spokesmen from England as typical Anglicans rather than as minority men whose reading of their Church's character, worship and teaching would have been warmly repudiated by most of their co-religionists at home."² Such a statement as that is purely *ex parte* propaganda. The real, and very obvious, reason for the choice of Malines rather than Westminster was that both Portal and Halifax had already had considerable experience of the temper of the Westminster Archdiocese, and of the events which had followed the intervention of Manning in the affairs of the A.P.U.C. and of Vaughan in the enquiry into Anglican ordinations. There can be no reasonable doubt that an approach to Westminster, of the kind which was made to Malines, would have met with a rebuff. A wide variety

¹ Bell, *op. cit.*, pp. 1284 ff.

² Oldmeadow, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 362.

of questions were, in the event, discussed at Malines, and although the death of Cardinal Mercier cut short the Conversations long before they had reached the point of any decisive result, yet the work initiated there is like a snowball still rolling onwards and increasing in size and momentum, and it is not even yet possible to assess the value of the Conversations. It is necessary, however, to repudiate emphatically the summing-up of the matter by Cardinal Bourne's biographer. He writes: "As for the plea that the Conversations engendered good feeling, it was not true. Although the gatherings at Malines certainly gave the ten, or most of them, a respect for one another's courtesy and even a pleasant camaraderie, their effect outside was to sharpen discord. In the Church of England, outside a narrow circle, they aroused suspicion and even anger. By English Catholics they could not be regarded otherwise than as a disdainful belittlement of their status in the Church; a belittlement made worse by the imputation of jealousy."¹

In fact, of course, the majority of Anglicans and great numbers of English Roman Catholics would reject such sentiments. Unhappy feeling was to some extent created, it is true, and it is well to realize that it was artificially fostered by a periodical over which Cardinal Bourne had close control and which was edited by his biographer. It was also partly fostered by certain sections of the Church of England, but the majority of even moderate men were genuinely hopeful of advance being made. In the years since Malines the spirit of the Conversations has inspired many informal talks between groups of Anglicans and Romans.

The names of the distinguished group of men who took part in the Conversations, coupled with the good-will, guarded though it was in expression, of the Archbishop of Canterbury, were a guarantee that the ideal of Anglican-Roman reunion, however far in the distance it may be, had ceased to be the preoccupation of a small and more extreme party among English Catholics, and had now been seen to be a true and rightful goal of the whole Oxford Movement. It is true that considerable differences still exist between Anglican Catholics as to the means to be employed to bring about this union, and even as to the nature of the union itself, but the desirability of such a union, when both Churches have shown themselves ready for it, is no longer seriously

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 411-412.

questioned by anyone who would call himself a Catholic in the Church of England and who would wish his opinion to be seriously considered.

Much remains to be done for the ecumenical ideals of the Oxford Movement to become realities either in East or West, but "a torch has been lighted which, by God's grace, shall not be put out".

INDEX

ANDREWES, Bp. LANCELOT, 1-2
 Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union, 82
Apostolicae Curae, the Bull, 74-77
 Arsenius, Metropolitan, 5
 Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, 32-39, 82
 Badger, Rev. G. P., 56
 Baring-Gould, Rev. S., 32
 Barrington, Bp. S., 8-9
 Batiffol, Mgr. P., 86
 Beauvoir, Rev. W., 6
 Benson, Rev. R. M., 33
 Birkbeck, W. J., 59, 75-76
 Bloxam, Rev. J. R., 26
 Blyth, Bp. P., 80
 Bonn, Reunion Conferences at, 66
 Bourne, Cardinal, 86-87
 Bramhall, Abp. J., 1
 Brandi, Rev. S. M., 76
 Browne, Bp. E. H., 63, 66
 Burgess, Bp. T., 10
 Carson, Rev. W. R., 76-77
 Carter, Rev. T. T., 55
 Charles II, King, 4
 Church, Very Rev. R. W., 16, 17, 25, 45, 61n
 Church Unity Octave, 83
 Close, Rev. F., 27
 Cobb, G. F., 51-52
 Collins, Rev. H., 32
 Dalgairns, Rev. J. D., 21, 24n, 25, 78
 Davidson, Abp. R. T., 84-85, 86, 87
 de Buck, Rev. V., 48
 de Lisle, Ambrose, 14, 26-27, 30-31, 32, 35, 36, 69n
 de Noailles, Cardinal, 6
 Doane, Bp. G. W., 12
 Döllinger, J. J. I. von, 44, 54, 65-66, 67-68
 Doyle, Bp. J., 10-11
 Duchesne, Mgr. L., 73, 74
 Duckworth, Rev. H. T. F., 79-80
 Dupanloup, Bp. F., 47, 48
 Eastern Church Association, 55-59, 79
 Eastern Orthodox Church, 28-30, 55-59, 79-80, 81-82
 Elicott, Bp. C. J., 45
 Evangelical Movement, the, 12
 Everest, Rev. W. F., 78
 Faber, Rev. F., 25
 Ffoulkes, Rev. E. S., 35, 47
 Forbes, Bp. A. P., 31-32, 33, 48, 53-55
 Forbes, Rev. G. H., 53-54
 Frere, Bp. W. H., 85
 Froude, Rev. R. H., 12, 20-22, 61n
 Gasparri, Cardinal, 73, 74
 Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., 24n, 53, 57, 75
 Gondon, J., 24n, 27, 44
 Gordon Riots, the, 7
 Gore, Bp. C., 86
 Guettée, Rev. V., 34
 Gutch, Rev. C., 14
 Hadleigh Conference, the, 60-61
 Halifax, Charles, Viscount, 14, 52n, 55, 73-75, 85-88
 Hamilton, Bp. W. K., 32, 44, 58
 Harper, Rev. T., 47-48
 Headlam, Bp. A. C., 79
 Hemmer, Abbé H., 86
 Holy Cross, Society of, 70
 Home Reunion Society, 62-64
 Honcharenko, Rev. A., 58
 Jelf, Rev. R. W., 60
 Jerusalem Bishopric, the, 28-29, 56, 61
 Jones, Rev. S., 78, 82-83
 Keble, Rev. J., 14, 19, 33, 41-41, 49, 61n
 Kidd, Rev. B. J., 86
 Kikuyu Conference, the, 84-85
 King, Bp. E., 64
 Kirk, Rev. T., 63
 Knottesford-Fortescue, Very Rev. E. B., 32
 Lacey, Rev. T. A., 74, 78-79
 Leander a Sancto Martino, Dom, 2-4
 Lee, Rev. F. G., 8, 27, 31, 32-33, 50, 69-72
 Liddon, Rev. H. P., 55, 66, 67-68
 Littledale, Rev. R. F., 14, 32, 34
 Livius, Rev. T., 71
 Lloyd, Bp. C., 12, 17
 Lockhart, Rev. W., 23, 31, 32, 38-39, 44
 Lowder, Rev. C. F., 32
 Lycurgos, Abp. A., 57-58
 MacColl, Rev. M., 32
 MacLagan, Abp. W. D., 75
 Malines Conversations, 85-88
 Manning, Cardinal, 15, 34-37, 40, 44, 48, 86
 Marshall, Rev. T. O., 64

Mason, Rev. A. J., 64
 Mathew, Bp. A. H., 72
 Medd, Rev. P. G., 64
 Mercier, Cardinal, 85-88
 Meyrick, Rev. F., 34, 65
 Montague, Bp. R., 2-3, 23
 Morris, Rev. J. B., 25
 Mossman, Rev. T. W., 69, 70
 Mowbray, A. T., 63
 Neale, Rev. J. M., 33, 55, 59, 65, 79
 Nelson, Horatio, Earl, 63-64
 Newman, Rev. J. H., 12, 16-17, 29n,
 42-43, 45-47, 48-50, 51, 53
 Nonjurors, the, 4-6
 Nugee, Rev. G., 55
 Oakeley, Rev. F., 12, 14, 21, 22-23, 25,
 42-43, 78
 Oakley, Very Rev. J., 32, 64
 Onderdonk, Bp. B. T., 18
 Oxenham, Rev. H. N., 32, 44
 Palmer, Rev. W. (of Magdalen College),
 15, 29-30
 Palmer, W. (of Worcester College), 12,
 14, 15-16, 60, 61n
 Panzani, G., 2-4
 Patrizi, Cardinal, 36-38
 Peel, Bp. W. G., 84
 Perceval, Rev. the Hon. A. P., 20, 61n
 Phillipps, Ambrose de Lisle. See de Lisle.
 Pitra, Cardinal, 53
 Portal, Abbe F., 52n, 73-74, 75, 85-88
 Potter, Bp. H., 58-59
 Pullan, Rev. L., 84-85
 Pusey, Rev. E. B., 12, 14, 28-29, 40-50,
 51, 57, 58, 60, 61-62
 Riley, A., 59
 Robinson, Very Rev. A., 85
 Rose, Rev. H. J., 12, 61n
 Routh, Rev. M. J., 29
 St. Thomas of Canterbury, Society of,
 83
 Seccombe, J. T., 69
 Sibthorpe, Rev. R. W., 26
 Talbot, Bp. E. S., 66
 Talbot, Mgr. G., 36-37, 46
 Temple, Abp. F., 75-76
Tract XC, 15, 16-19, 23, 53, 83
 Trent, Council of, 18, 21, 25, 41-42
Union chrétienne, *P.*, 34
Union Newspaper, 33-34
Union Review, 34-37
 Utrecht, Church of, 65-68
 Van Roey, Mgr., 85-86
 Vatican Council, 49-50, 51-59, 66, 70-71,
 75
 Vaughan, Cardinal, 74, 77n, 86
 Wake, Abp. W., 5, 6, 11
 Ward, W. G., 14, 15, 21, 23, 24n, 25,
 26-27, 43, 48, 78
 Weston, Bp. F., 84
 Wilberforce, Bp. S., 32
 Wilkinson, Bp. G. H., 64
 Williams, Rev. G., 57, 59, 79
 Williams, Rev. I., 12, 20
 Willis, Bp. J. J., 84
 Wiseman, Cardinal, 15, 25-26, 31, 34
 Wix, Rev. S., 9-10
 Wordsworth, Bp. Chr., 57
 Wordsworth, Bp. J., 55, 73, 76, 79, 81-82
 Young, Rev. J. F., 57